

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

VOL. V, 3.

WHOLE No. 19.

I.—THE STUDY OF HINDU GRAMMAR AND THE STUDY OF SANSKRIT.

To the beginning study of Sanskrit it was an immense advantage that there existed a Hindu science of grammar, and one of so high a character. To realize how great the advantage, one has only to compare the case of languages destitute of it—as for instance the Zend. It is a science of ancient date, and has even exercised a shaping influence on the language in which all or nearly all the classical literature has been produced. It was an outcome of the same general spirit which is seen in the so careful textual preservation and tradition of the ancient sacred literature of India; and there is doubtless a historical connection between the one and the other; though of just what nature is as yet unclear.

The character of the Hindu grammatical science was, as is usual in such cases, determined by the character of the language which was its subject. The Sanskrit is above all things an analyzable language, one admitting of the easy and distinct separation of ending from stem, and of derivative suffix from primitive word, back to the ultimate attainable elements, the so-called roots. Accordingly, in its perfected form (for all the preparatory stages are unknown to us), the Hindu grammar offers us an established body of roots, with rules for their conversion into stems and for the inflection of the latter, and also for the accompanying phonetic changes—this last involving and resting upon a phonetic science of extraordinary merit, which has called forth the highest admiration of modern scholars; nothing at all approaching it has been produced by any ancient people; it has served as the foundation in no small degree of our own phonetics: even as our science of

grammar and of language has borrowed much from India. The treatment of syntax is markedly inferior—though, after all, hardly more than in a measure to correspond with the inferiority of the Sanskrit sentence in point of structure, as compared with the Latin and the Greek. Into any more detailed description it is not necessary to our present purpose to enter; and the matter is one pretty well understood by the students of Indo-European language. It is generally well known also that the Hindu science, after a however long history of elaboration, became fixed for all future time in the system of a single grammarian, named Pāṇini (believed, though on grounds far from convincing, to have lived two or three centuries before the Christian era). Pāṇini's work has been commented without end, corrected in minor points, condensed, re-cast in arrangement, but never rebelled against or superseded; and it is still the authoritative standard of good Sanskrit. Its form of presentation is of the strangest: a miracle of ingenuity, but of perverse and wasted ingenuity. The only object aimed at in it is brevity, at the sacrifice of everything else—of order, of clearness, of even intelligibility except by the aid of keys and commentaries and lists of words, which then are furnished in profusion. To determine a grammatical point out of it is something like constructing a passage of text out of an *index verborum*: if you are sure that you have gathered up every word that belongs in the passage, and have put them all in the right order, you have got the right reading; but only then. If you have mastered Pāṇini sufficiently to bring to bear upon the given point every rule that relates to it, and in due succession, you have settled the case; but that is no easy task. For example, it takes nine mutually limitative rules, from all parts of the text-book, to determine whether a certain aorist shall be *ajāgariṣam* or *ajāgāriṣam* (the case is reported in the preface to Müller's grammar): there is lacking only a tenth rule, to tell us that the whole word is a false and never-used formation. Since there is nothing to show how far the application of a rule reaches, there are provided treatises of laws of interpretation to be applied to them; but there is a residual rule underlying and determining the whole: that both the grammar and the laws of interpretation must be so construed as to yield good and acceptable forms, and not otherwise—and this implies (if that were needed) a condemnation of the whole mode of presentation of the system as a failure.

Theoretically, all that is prescribed and allowed by Pāṇini and

his accepted commentators is Sanskrit, and nothing else is entitled to the name. The young pandit, then, is expected to master the system and to govern his Sanskrit speech and writing by it. This he does, with immense pains and labor, then naturally valuing the acquisition in part according to what it has cost him. The same course was followed by those European scholars who had to make themselves the pupils of Hindu teachers, in acquiring Sanskrit for the benefit of Europe; and (as was said above) they did so to their very great advantage. Equally as a matter of course, the same must still be done by any one who studies in India, who has to deal with the native scholars, win their confidence and respect, and gain their aid: they must be met upon their own ground. But it is a question, and one of no slight practical importance, how far Western scholars in general are to be held to this method: whether Pāṇini is for us also the law of Sanskrit usage; whether we are to study the native Hindu grammar in order to learn Sanskrit.

There would be less reason for asking this question, if the native grammar were really the instrumentality by which the conserving tradition of the old language had been carried on. But that is a thing both in itself impossible and proved by the facts of the case to be untrue. No one ever mastered a list of roots with rules for their extension and inflection, and then went to work to construct texts upon that basis. Rather, the transmission of Sanskrit has been like the transmission of any highly cultivated language, only with differences of degree. The learner has his models which he imitates; he makes his speech after the example of that of his teacher, only under the constant government of grammatical rule, enforced by the requirement to justify out of the grammar any word or form as to which a question is raised. Thus the language has moved on by its own inertia, only falling, with further removal from its natural vernacular basis, more and more passively and mechanically into the hands of the grammarians. All this is like the propagation of literary English or German; only that here there is much more of a vernacular usage that shows itself able to override and modify the rules of grammar. It is yet more closely like the propagation of Latin; only that here the imitation of previous usage is frankly acknowledged as the guide, there being no iron system of grammar to assume to take its place. That such has really been the history of the later or classical Sanskrit is sufficiently shown by the facts. There is no absolute coinci-

dence between it and the language which Pāṇini teaches. The former, indeed, includes little that the grammarians forbid ; but, on the other hand, it lacks a great deal that they allow or prescribe. The difference between the two is so great that Benfey, a scholar deeply versed in the Hindu science, calls it a grammar without a corresponding language, as he calls the pre-classical dialects a language without a grammar.¹ If such a statement can be made with any reason, it would appear that there is to be assumed, as the subject of Hindu grammatical science, a peculiar dialect of Sanskrit, which we may call the grammarians' Sanskrit, different both from the pre-classical dialects and from the classical, and standing either between them or beside them in the general history of Indian language. And it becomes a matter of importance to us to ascertain what this grammarians' Sanskrit is, how it stands related to the other varieties of Sanskrit, and whether it is entitled to be the leading object of our Sanskrit study. Such questions must be settled by a comparison of the dialect referred to with the other dialects, and of them with one another. And it will be found, upon such comparison, that the earlier and later forms of the Vedic dialect, the dialects of the Brāhmaṇas and Sūtras, and the classical Sanskrit, stand in a filial relation, each to its predecessor, are nearly or quite successive forms of the same language ; while the grammarians' Sanskrit, as distinguished from them, is a thing of grammatical rule merely, having never had any real existence as a language, and being on the whole unknown in practice to even the most modern pandits.

The main thing which makes of the grammarians' Sanskrit a special and peculiar language is its list of roots. Of these there are reported to us about two thousand, with no intimation of any difference in character among them, or warning that a part of them may and that another part may not be drawn upon for forms to be actually used ; all stand upon the same plane. But more than half—actually more than half—of them never have been met with, and never will be met with, in the Sanskrit literature of any age. When this fact began to come to light, it was long fondly hoped, or believed, that the missing elements would yet turn up in some corner of the literature not hitherto ransacked ; but all expectation of that has now been abandoned. One or another does appear from time to time ; but what are they among so many ? The last not-

¹ *Einleitung in die Grammatik der vedischen Sprache*, 1874, pp. 3, 4.

able case was that of the root *stigh*, discovered in the *Māitrāyaṇī-Saṁhitā*, a text of the *Brāhmaṇa* period; but the new roots found in such texts are apt to turn out wanting in the lists of the grammarians. Beyond all question, a certain number of cases are to be allowed for, of real roots, proved such by the occurrence of their evident cognates in other related languages, and chancing not to appear in the known literature; but they can go only a very small way indeed toward accounting for the eleven hundred unauthenticated roots. Others may have been assumed as underlying certain derivatives or bodies of derivatives—within due limits, a perfectly legitimate proceeding; but the cases thus explainable do not prove to be numerous. There remain then the great mass, whose presence in the lists no ingenuity has yet proved sufficient to account for. And in no small part, they bear their falsity and artificiality on the surface, in their phonetic form and in the meanings ascribed to them; we can confidently say that the Sanskrit language, known to us through a long period of development, neither had nor could have any such roots. How the grammarians came to concoct their list, rejected in practice by themselves and their own pupils, is hitherto an unexplained mystery. No special student of the native grammar, to my knowledge, has attempted to cast any light upon it; and it was left for Dr. Edgren, no partisan of the grammarians, to group and set forth the facts for the first time, in the *Journal of the American Oriental Society* (Vol. XI, 1882 [but the article printed in 1879], pp. 1-55), adding a list of the real roots, with brief particulars as to their occurrence.¹ It is quite clear, with reference to this fundamental and most important item, of what character the grammarians' Sanskrit is. The real Sanskrit of the latest period is, as concerns its roots, a true successor to that of the earliest period, and through the known intermediates; it has lost some of the roots of its predecessors, as each of these some belonging to its own predecessors or predecessor; it has, also like these, won a certain number not earlier found: both in such measure as was to be expected. As for the rest of the asserted roots of the grammar, to account for them is not a matter that concerns at all the Sanskrit language and its history; it only concerns the history of the Hindu science of grammar. That, too,

¹ I have myself now in press a much fuller account of the quotable roots of the language, with all their quotable tense-stems and primary derivatives—everything accompanied by a definition of the period of its known occurrence in the history of the language.

has come to be pretty generally acknowledged.¹ Every one who knows anything of the history of Indo-European etymology knows how much mischief the grammarians' list of roots wrought in the hands of the earlier more incautious and credulous students of Sanskrit: how many false and worthless derivations were founded upon them. That sort of work, indeed, is not yet entirely a thing of the past; still, it has come to be well understood by most scholars that no alleged Sanskrit root can be accepted as real unless it is supported by such a use in the literary records of the language as authenticates it—for there are such things in the later language as artificial occurrences, forms made for once or twice from roots taken out of the grammarians' list, by a natural license, which one is only surprised not to see oftener availed of (there are hardly more than a dozen or two of such cases quotable): that they appear so seldom is the best evidence of the fact already pointed out above, that the grammar had, after all, only a superficial and negative influence upon the real tradition of the language.

It thus appears that a Hindu grammarian's statement as to the fundamental elements of his language is without authority until tested by the actual facts of the language, as represented by the Sanskrit literature. But the principle won here is likely to prove of universal application; for we have no reason to expect to find the grammarians absolutely trustworthy in other departments of their work, when they have failed so signally in one; there can be nothing in their system that will not require to be tested by the recorded facts of the language, in order to determine its true value. How this is, we will proceed to ascertain by examining a few examples.

In the older language, but not in the oldest (for it is wanting in the Veda), there is formed a periphrastic future tense active by compounding a *nomen agentis* with an auxiliary, the present tense of the verb *as* 'be': thus, *dātā 'smi* (literally *dator sum*) 'I will give,' etc. It is quite infrequent as compared with the other future, yet common enough to require to be regarded as a part of the general Sanskrit verb-system. To this active tense the grammarians give a corresponding middle, although the auxiliary in its independent

¹ Not, indeed, universally; one may find among the selected verbs that are conjugated in full at the end of F. M. Müller's Sanskrit Grammar, no very small number of those that are utterly unknown to Sanskrit usage, ancient or modern.

use has no middle inflection; it is made with endings modified so as to stand in the usual relation of middle endings to active, and further with conversion in 1st sing. of the radical *s* to *h*—a very anomalous substitution, of which there is not, I believe, another example in the language. Now what support has this middle tense in actual use? Only this: that in the Brāhmaṇas occur four sporadic instances of attempts to make by analogy middle forms for this tense (they are all reported in my Sanskrit Grammar, § 947; further search has brought to light no additional examples): two of them are 1st sing., one having the form *se* for the auxiliary, the other *he*, as taught in the grammar; and in the whole later literature, epic and classical, I find record of the occurrence of only one further case, *darçayitāhe* (in Nāiṣ. V 71.)¹ Here also, the classical dialect is the true continuator of the pre-classical; it is only in the grammarians' Sanskrit that every verb conjugated in the middle voice has also a middle periphrastic future.

There is another and much more important part of verbal inflection—namely, the whole aorist-system, in all its variety—as to which the statements of the grammarians are to be received with especial distrust, for the reason that in the classical language the aorist is a decadent formation. In the older dialects, down to the last Sūtra, and through the entire list of early and genuine Upanishads, the aorist has its own special office, that of designating the immediate past, and is always to be found where such designation is called for; later, even in the epos, it is only another preterit, equivalent in use to imperfect and perfect, and hence of no value, and subsisting only in occasional use, mainly as a survival from an earlier condition of the language. Thus, for example, of the first kind of aorist, the root-aorist, forms are made in pre-classical Sanskrit from about 120 roots; of these, 15 make forms in the later language also, mostly sporadically (only *gā*, *dā*, *dhā*, *pā*, *sthā*, *bhū* less infrequently); and 8 more in the later language only, all in an occurrence or two (all but one, in active precative forms, as to which see below). Again, of the fifth aorist-form, the *iṣ*-aorist (rather the

¹ Here, as elsewhere below, my authority for the later literature is chiefly the Petersburg Lexicon (the whole older literature I have examined for myself), and my statements are, of course, always open to modification by the results of further researches. But all the best and most genuine part of the literature has been carefully and thoroughly excerpted for the Lexicon; and for the Mahābhārata we have now the explicit statements of Holtzmann, in his Gram-matisches aus dem Mahabharata, Leipzig, 1884.

most frequent of all), forms are made in the older language from 140 roots, and later from only 18 of these (and sporadically, except in the case of *grah*, *vad*, *vadh*, *vid*), with a dozen more in the later language exclusively, all sporadic except *ṣaṅk* (which is not a Vedic root). Once more, as regards the third or reduplicated aorist, the proportion is slightly different, because of the association of that aorist with the causative conjugation, and the frequency of the latter in use; here, against about 110 roots quotable from the earlier language, 16 of them also in the later, there are about 30 found in the later alone (nearly all of them only sporadically, and none with any frequency). And the case is not otherwise with the remaining forms. The facts being such, it is easily seen that general statements made by the grammarians as to the range of occurrence of each form, and as to the occurrence of one form in the active and a certain other one in the middle from a given root, must be of very doubtful authority; in fact, as regards the latter point, they are the more suspicious as lacking any tolerable measure of support from the facts of the older language. But there are much greater weaknesses than these in the grammarians' treatment of the aorist.

Let us first turn our attention to the aorist optative, the so-called precativ (or benedictive). This formation is by the native grammarians not recognized as belonging to the aorist at all—not even so far as to be put next the aorist in their general scheme of conjugation; they suffer the future-systems to intervene between the two. This is in them fairly excusable as concerns the precativ active, since it is the optative of the root-aorist, and so has an aspect as if it might come independently from the root directly; nor, indeed, can we much blame them for overlooking the relation of their precativ middle to the sibilant or sigmatic aorist, considering that they ignore tense-systems and modes; but that their European imitators, down to the very latest, should commit the same oversight is a different matter. The contrast, now, between the grammarians' dialect and the real Sanskrit is most marked as regards the middle forms. According to the grammar, the precativ middle is to be made from every root, and even for its secondary conjugations, the causative etc. It has two alternative modes of formation, which we see to correspond to two of the forms of the sibilant aorist: the *s*-aorist, namely, and the *iṣ*-aorist. Of course, a complete inflection is allowed it. To justify all this, now, I am able to point to only a single occurrence of a middle

precative in the whole later literature, including the epics: that is *virīṣṭa*, in the Bhāgavata-Purāṇa (III 9, 24), a text notable for its artificial imitation of ancient forms (the same word occurs also in the Rig-Veda); it is made, as will be noticed, from a reduplicated aorist stem, and so is unauthorized by grammatical rule. A single example in a whole literature, and that a false one! In the pre-classical literature also, middle precative forms are made hardly more than sporadically, or from less than 40 roots in all (so far as I have found); those belonging to the *s* and *iṣ*-aorists are, indeed, among the most numerous (14 each), but those of the root-aorist do not fall short of them (also 14 roots), and there are examples from three of the other four aorists. Except a single 3d pl. (in *irata*, instead of *iran*), only the three singular persons and the 1st pl. are quotable, and forms occur without as well as with the adscititious *s* between mode-sign and personal ending which is the special characteristic of a precative as distinguished from a simply optative form. Here, again, we have a formation sporadic in the early language and really extinct in the later, but erected by the grammarians into a regular part of every verb-system.

With the precative active the case is somewhat different. This also, indeed, is rare even to sporadicness, being, so far as I know, made from only about 60 roots in the whole language—and of these, only half can show forms containing the true precative *s*. But it is not quite limited to the pre-classical dialects; it is made also later from 15 roots, 9 of which are additional to those which make a precative in the older language. Being in origin an optative of the root-aorist, it comes, as we may suppose, to seem to be a formation from the root directly, and so to be extended beyond the limits of the aorist; from a clear majority (about three fifths) of all the roots that make it, it has no other aorist-forms by its side. And this begins even in the earliest period (with half-a-dozen roots in the Veda, and toward a score besides in the Brāhmaṇa and Sūtra); although there the precative more usually makes a part of a general aorist-formation: for instance, and especially, from the root *bhū*, whose precative forms are oftener met with than those of all other roots together, and which is the only root from which more than two real precative persons are quotable. How rare it is even in the epos is shown by the fact that Holtzmann¹ is able to quote only six forms (and one of these

¹ In his work already cited, at p. 32.

doubtful, and another a false formation) from the whole Mahābhārata, one of them occurring twice; while the first book of the Rāmāyaṇa (about 4500 lines) has the single *bhūyāt*. Since it is not quite extinct in the classical period, the Hindu grammarians could not, perhaps, well help teaching its formation; and, considering the general absence of perspective from their work, we should hardly expect them to explain that it was the rare survival of an anciently little-used formation; but we have here another striking example of the great discordance between the real Sanskrit and the grammarians' dialect, and of the insufficiency of the information respecting the former obtainable from the rules for the latter.

Again, the reduplicated or third form of aorist, though it has become attached to the causative secondary conjugation (by a process in the Veda not yet complete), as the regular aorist of that conjugation, is not made from the derivative causative stem, but comes from the root itself, not less directly than do the other aorist-formations—except in the few cases where the causative stem contains a *p* added to *ā*: thus, *atiṣṭhipat* from stem *sthāpaya*, root *sthā*. Perhaps misled by this exception, however, the grammarians teach the formation of the reduplicated aorist from the causative stem, through the intermediate process of converting the stem back to the root, by striking off its conjugation-sign and reducing its strengthened vowel to the simpler root-form. That is to say, we are to make, for example, *abūbhuvat* from the stem *bhāvaya*, by cutting off *aya* and reducing the remainder *bhāv* or *bhāu* to *bhū*, instead of making it from *bhū* directly! That is a curious etymological process; quite a side-piece to deriving *variṇas* and *variṣṭha* from *uru*, and the like, as the Hindu grammarians and their European copyists would likewise have us do. There is one point where the matter is brought to a crucial test: namely, in roots that end in *u* or *ū*; where, if the vowel on which the reduplication is formed is an *u*-vowel, the reduplication-vowel should be of the same character; but, in any other case, an *i*-vowel. Thus, in the example already taken, *bhāvaya* ought to make *abibhavat*, just as it makes *bibhāvayīṣati* in the case of a real derivation from the causative stem; and such forms as *abibhavat* are, in fact, in a great number of cases either prescribed or allowed by the grammarians; but I am not aware of their having been ever met with in use, earlier or later, with the single exception of *apiplavam*, occurring once in the Čatapatha-Brahmaṇa (VI ii, 1, 8).

Again, the grammarians give a peculiar and problematic rule for an alternative formation of certain passive tenses (aorist and futures) from the special 3d sing. aor. pass.; they allow it in the case of all roots ending in vowels, and of *grah*, *dr̥ṣ*, *han*. Thus, for example, from the root *dā* are allowed *adāyīṣi*, *dāyīṣyate*, *dāyitā*, beside *adiṣi*, *dāsyate*, *dātā*. What all this means is quite obscure, since there is no usage, either early or late, to cast light upon it. The Rig-Veda has once (I 147, 5) *dhāyīṣ*, from root *dhā*; but this, being active, is rather a hindrance than a help. The Jāim. Brāhmaṇa has once (I 321) *ākhyāyīṣyante*; but this appears to be a form analogous with *hvayīṣyate* etc., and so proves nothing. The Bhāg. Purāṇa has once (VIII 13, 36) *tāyitā*, which the Petersburg Lexicon refers to root *tan*; but if there is such a thing as the secondary root *tāy*, as claimed by the grammarians, it perhaps belongs rather there. And there remain, so far as I can discover, only *asthāyīṣi* (Daçak. [Wilson], p. 117, l. 6) and *anāyīṣata* (Ind. Sprüche³, 6187, from the Kuvalayānanda); and these are with great probability to be regarded as artificial forms, made because the grammar declares them correct. It seems not unlikely that some misapprehension or blunder lies at the foundation of these rules of the grammar; at any rate, the formation is only grammarians' Sanskrit, and not even pandits'; and it should never be obtruded upon the attention of beginners in the language.

Again, the secondary ending *dhvam* of 2d pl. mid. sometimes has to take the form *ḍhvam*. In accordance with the general euphonic usages of the language, this should be whenever in the present condition of Sanskrit there has been lost before the ending a lingual sibilant; thus: we have *anedḍhvam* from *aneṣ + dhvam*, and *apaviḍhvam* from *apaviṣ + dhvam*; we should further have in the precative *bhaviṣiḍhvam* from *bhaviṣi-ṣ-dhvam*, if the form ever occurred, as, unfortunately, it does not. And, so far as I know, there is not to be found, either in the earlier language or the later (and as to the former I can speak with authority), a single instance of *ḍhvam* in any other situation—the test-cases, however, being far from numerous. But the Hindu grammarians, if they are reported rightly by their European pupils (which in this instance is hard to believe), give rules as to the change of the ending upon this basis only for the *s*-aorist; for the *iṣ*-aorist and its optative (the precative), they make the choice between *ḍhvam* and *dhvam* to depend upon whether the *i* is or is not "preceded by a semi-vowel or *h*:" that is, *apaviṣ + dhvam* gives *apaviḍhvam*, but *ajaniṣ*

+ *dhvam* gives *ajanidhvam*, and so likewise we should have *janiṣidhvam*. It would be curious to know what ground the grammarians imagined themselves to have for laying down such a rule as this, wherein there is a total absence of discoverable connection between cause and effect; and it happens that all the quotable examples—*ajanidhvam*, *artidhvam*, *aindhidhvam*, *vepidhvam*—are opposed to their rule, but accordant with reason. What is yet worse, however, is that the grammar extends the same conversion of *dh* to *ḍh*, under the same restrictions, to the primary ending *dhve* of the perfect likewise, with which it has nothing whatever to do—teaching us that, for instance, *cakr* and *tusṭu* + *dhve* make necessarily *cakṛḍhve* and *tusṭuḍhve*, and that *dadhr-i* + *dhve* makes either *dadhrḍhve* or *dadhridhve*, while *tutud-i* + *dhve* makes only *tutudidhve*! This appears to me the most striking case of downright unintelligent blundering on the part of the native grammarians that has come to notice; if there is any way of relieving them of the reproach of it, their partisans ought to cast about at once to find it.

A single further matter of prime importance may be here referred to, in illustration of the character of the Hindu grammarians as classifiers and presenters of the facts of their language. By reason of the extreme freedom and wonderful regularity of word-composition in Sanskrit, the grammarians were led to make a classification of compounds in a manner that brought true enlightenment to European scholars; and the classification has been largely adopted as a part of modern philological science, along even with its bizarre terminology. Nothing could be more accurate and happier than the distinction of dependent, descriptive, possessive, and copulative compounds; only their titles—'his man' (*tatpuruṣa*), 'act-sustaining' (? *karmadhāraya*), 'much-rice' (*bahuvrīhi*), and 'couple' (*dvandva*), respectively—can hardly claim to be worth preserving. But it is the characteristic of Hindu science generally not to be able to stop when it has done enough; and so the grammarians have given us, on the same plane of division with these four capital classes, two more, which they call *dvigu* ('two-cow') and *avyayibhāva* ('indeclinable-becoming'); and these have no *raison d'être*, but are collections of special cases belonging to some of the other classes, and so heterogeneous that their limits are hardly capable of definition: the *dvigu*-class are secondary adjective compounds, but sometimes, like other adjectives, used as nouns; and an *avyayibhāva* is always the adverbially-

used accusative neuter of an adjective compound. It would be a real service on the part of some scholar, versed in the Hindu science, to draw out a full account of the so-called *dvigu*-class and its boundaries, and to show if possible how the grammarians were misled into establishing it. But it will probably be long before these two false classes cease to haunt the concluding chapters of Sanskrit grammars, or writers on language to talk of the six kinds of compounds in Sanskrit.¹

Points in abundance, of major or minor consequence, it would be easy to bring up in addition, for criticism or for question. Thus, to take a trifle or two: according to the general analogies of the language, we ought to speak of the root *gr̥h*, instead of *grah*; probably the Hindu science adopts the latter form because of some mechanical advantage on the side of brevity resulting from it, in the rules prescribing forms and derivatives: the instances are not few in which that can be shown to have been the preponderating consideration, leading to the sacrifice of things more important. One may conjecture that similar causes led to the setting up of a root *div* instead of *dīv*, 'play, gamble': that it may have been found easier to prescribe the prolongation of the *i* than its irregular gunation, in *devana* etc. This has unfortunately misled the authors of the Petersburg Lexicons into their strange and indefensible identification of the asserted root *div* 'play' with the so-called root *div* 'shine': the combination of meanings is forced and unnatural; and then especially the phonetic form of the two roots is absolutely distinct, the one showing only short *i* and *u* (as in *divam*, *dyubhis*), the other always and only long *ī* and *ū* (as in *dīvyati*, *-dīvan*, and *-dyū*, *dyūta*); the one root is really *dīu*, and the other *dīū* (it may be added that the Petersburg Lexicon, on similar evidence, inconsistently but correctly writes the roots *sīv* and *srīv*, instead of *siv* and *sriv*).

It would be easy to continue the work of illustration much further; but this must be enough to show how and how far we have to use and to trust the teachings of the Hindu grammarians. Or,

¹ Spiegel, for example (Altiranische Grammatik, p. 229), thinks it necessary to specify that *dvigu*-compounds do, to be sure, occur also in the Old Persian dialects, but that they in no respect form a special class; and a very recent Sanskrit grammar in Italian (Pulle, Turin, 1883) gives as the four primary classes of compounds the *dvandva*, *tatpuruṣa*, *bahuvrīhi*, and *avyayibhāva*—as if one were to say that the kingdoms in Nature are four: animal, vegetable, mineral, and cactuses.

if one prefer to employ the Benfeyan phrase, we see something of what this language is which has a grammar but not an existence, and in what relation it stands to the real Sanskrit language, begun in the Veda, and continued without a break down to our own times, all the rules of the grammar having been able only slightly to stiffen and unnaturalize it. Surely, what we desire to have to do with is the Sanskrit, and not the imaginary *dialect* that fits the definitions of Pāṇini. There is no escaping the conclusion that, if we would understand Sanskrit, we may not take the grammarians as authorities, but only as witnesses; not a single rule given or fact stated by them is to be accepted on their word, without being tested by the facts of the language as laid down in the less subjective and more trustworthy record of the literature. Of course, most of what the native grammar teaches is true and right; but, until after critical examination, no one can tell which part. Of course, also, there is more or less of genuine supplementary material in the grammarians' treatises—material especially lexical, but doubtless in some measure also grammatical—which needs to be worked in so as to complete our view of the language; but what this genuine material is, as distinguished from the artificial and false, is only to be determined by a thorough and cautious comparison of the entire system of the grammar with the whole recorded language. Such a comparison has not yet been made, and is hardly even making: in part, to be sure, because the time for it has been long in coming; but mainly because those who should be making it are busy at something else. The skilled students of the native grammar, as it seems to me, have been looking at their task from the wrong point of view, and laboring in the wrong direction. They have been trying to put the non-existent grammarians' *dialect* in the place of the genuine Sanskrit. They have thought it their duty to learn out of Pāṇini and his successors, and to set forth for the benefit of the world, what the Sanskrit really is, instead of studying and setting forth and explaining (and, where necessary, accounting for and excusing) Pāṇini's system itself. They have failed to realize that, instead of a divine revelation, they have in their hands a human work—a very able one, indeed, but also imperfect, like other human works, full of the prescription in place of description that characterizes all Hindu productions, and most perversely constructed; and that in studying it they are only studying a certain branch of Hindu science: one that is, indeed, of the highest interest, and has an

important bearing on the history of the language, especially since the *dicta* of the grammarians have had a marked influence in shaping the latest form of Sanskrit—not always to its advantage. Hence the insignificant amount of real progress that the study of Hindu grammar has made in the hands of European scholars. Its career was well inaugurated, now nearly forty-five years ago (1839-40), by Böhtlingk's edition of Pāṇini's text, with extracts from the native commentaries, followed by an extremely stingy commentary by the editor; but it has not been succeeded by anything of importance,¹ until now that a critical edition of the *Mahābhāṣya*, by Kielhorn, is passing through the press, and is likely soon to be completed: a highly meritorious work, worthy of European learning, and likely, if followed up in the right spirit, to begin a new era in its special branch of study. Considering the extreme difficulty of the system, and the amount of labor that is required before the student can win any available mastery of it, it is incumbent upon the representatives of the study to produce an edition of Pāṇini accompanied with a version, a digest of the leading comments on each rule, and an index that shall make it possible to find what the native authorities teach upon each given point: that is to say, to open the grammatical science to knowledge virtually at first hand without the lamentable waste of time thus far unavoidable—a waste, because both needless and not sufficiently rewarded by its results.

A curious kind of superstition appears to prevail among certain Sanskrit scholars: they cannot feel that they have the right to accept a fact of the language unless they find it set down in Pāṇini's rules. It may well be asked, on the contrary, of what consequence it is, except for its bearing on the grammatical science itself, whether a given fact is or is not so set down. A fact in the pre-classical language is confessedly quite independent of Pāṇini; he may take account of it and he may not; and no one knows as yet what the ground is of the selection he makes for inclusion in his system. As for a fact in the classical language, it is altogether likely to fall within the reach of one of the great

¹ For the photographic reproduction, in 1874, of a single manuscript of Patanjali's *Mahābhāṣya* or 'Great Comment' (on Pāṇini), with the glosses upon it, was but a costly piece of child's play; and the English government, as if to make the enterprise a complete *fiasco*, sent all the copies thus prepared to India, to be buried there in native keeping, instead of placing them in European libraries, within reach of Western scholars.

grammarian's rules—at least, as these have been extended and restricted and amended by his numerous successors: and this is a thing much to the credit of the grammar; but what bearing it has upon the language would be hard to say. If, however, we should seem to meet with a fact ignored by the grammar, or contravening its rules, we should have to look to see whether supporting facts in the language did not show its genuineness in spite of the grammar. On the other hand, there are facts in the language, especially in its latest records, which have a false show of existence, being the artificial product of the grammar's prescription or permission; and there was nothing but the healthy conservatism of the true tradition of the language to keep them from becoming vastly more numerous. And then, finally, there are the infinite number of facts which, so far as the grammar is concerned, should be or might be in the language, only that they do not happen ever to occur there; for here lies the principal discordance between the grammar and the language. The statement of the grammar that such a thing is so and so is of quite uncertain value, until tested by the facts of the language; and in this testing, it is the grammar that is on trial, that is to be condemned for artificiality or commended for faithfulness; not the language, which is quite beyond our jurisdiction. It cannot be too strongly urged that the Sanskrit, even that of the most modern authors, even that of the pandits of the present day, is the successor, by natural processes of tradition, of the older dialects; and that the grammar is a more or less successful attempt at its description, the measure of the success being left for us to determine, by comparison of the one with the other.

To maintain this is not to disparage the Hindu grammatical science; it is only to put it in its true place. The grammar remains nearly if not altogether the most admirable product of the scientific spirit in India, ranking with the best products of that spirit that the world has seen; we will scant no praise to it, if we only are not called on to bow down to it as authoritative. So we regard the Greek science of astronomy as one of the greatest and most creditable achievements of the human intellect since men first began to observe and deduce; but we do not plant ourselves upon its point of view in setting forth the movements of the heavenly bodies—though the men of the Middle Ages did so, to their advantage, and the system of epicycles maintained itself in existence, by dint of pure conservatism, long after its artificiality had

been demonstrated. That the early European Sanskrit grammars assumed the basis and worked in the methods of the Hindu science was natural and praiseworthy. Bopp was the first who had knowledge and independence enough to begin effectively the work of subordinating Hindu to Western science, using the materials and deductions of the former so far as they accorded with the superior methods of the latter, and turning his attention to the records of the language itself, as fast as they became accessible to him. Since his time, there has been in some respects a retrogression rather than an advance; European scholars have seemed to take satisfaction in submitting themselves slavishly to Hindu teachers, and the grammarians' dialect has again been thrust forward into the place which the Sanskrit language ought to occupy. To refer to but a striking example or two: in Müller's grammar the native science is made the supreme rule after a fashion that is sometimes amusing in its naïveté, and the genuine and the fictitious are mingled inextricably, in his rules, his illustrations, and his paradigms, from one end of the volume to the other. And a scholar of the highest rank, long resident in India but now of Vienna, Professor Bühler, has only last year put forth a useful practical introduction to the language, with abundant exercises for writing and speaking,¹ in which the same spirit of subservience to Hindu methods is shown in an extreme degree, and both forms and material are not infrequently met with which are not Sanskrit, but belong only to the non-existent grammarians' dialect. Its standpoint is clearly characterized by its very first clause, which teaches that "Sanskrit verbs have ten tenses and modes"—that is to say, because the native grammar failed to make the distinction between tense and mode, or to group these formations together into systems, coming from a common tense-stem, Western pupils are to be taught to do the same. This seems about as much an anachronism as if the author had begun, likewise after Hindu example, with the statement that "Sanskrit parts of speech are four: name, predicate, preposition, and particle." Further on, in the same paragraph, he allows (since the Hindus also do so) that "the first four [tenses and modes] are derived from a special present stem"; but he leaves it to be implied, both here and later, that the remaining six come directly from the root. From this we

¹ This work, somewhat recast grammatically, is about to be reproduced in English by Professor Perry, of Columbia College, New York.

should have to infer, for example, that *dadāti* comes from a stem, but *dadātha* from the root; that we are to divide *naçya-ti* but *dā-syati*, *a-viça-t* but *a-sic-at*, and so on; and (though this is a mere oversight) that *ayāt* contains a stem, but *adāt* a pure root. No real grammarian can talk of present stems without talking of aorist stems also; nor is the variety of the latter so much inferior to that of the former; it is only the vastly greater frequency of occurrence of present forms that makes the differences of their stems the more important ground of classification. These are but specimens of the method of the book, which, in spite of its merits, is not in its present form a good one to put in the hands of beginners, because it teaches them so much that they will have to unlearn later, if they are to understand the Sanskrit language.

One more point, of minor consequence, may be noted, in which the habit of Western philology shows itself too subservient to the whims of the Sanskrit native grammarians: the order of the varieties of present stems, and the designation of the conjugation classes as founded on it. We accept the Hindu order of the cases in noun-inflection, not seeking to change it, though unfamiliar, because we see that it has a reason, and a good one; but no one has ever been ingenious enough even to conjecture a reason for the Hindu order of the classes. Chance itself, if they had been thrown together into a hat, and set down in their order as drawn out, could not more successfully have sundered what belongs together, and juxtaposed the discordant. That being the case, there is no reason for our paying any heed to the arrangement. In fact, the heed that we do pay is a perversion; the Hindus do not speak of first class, second class, etc., but call each class by the name of its leading verb, as *bhū*-verbs, *ad*-verbs, and so on; and it was a decided merit of Müller, in his grammar, to try to substitute for the mock Hindu method this true one, which does not make such a dead pull upon the mechanical memory of the learner. As a matter of course, the most defensible and acceptable method is that of calling each class by its characteristic feature—as, the reduplicating class, the *ya*-class, and so on. But one still meets, in treatises and papers on general philology, references to verbs “of the fourth class,” “of the seventh class,” and so on. So far as this is not mere mechanical habit, it is pedantry—as if one meant to say: “I am so familiar with the Sanskrit language and its native grammar that I can tell the order in which the bodies of similarly-conjugated roots follow one another in the *dhātupāṭhas*,

though no one knows any reason for it, and the Hindu grammarians themselves lay no stress upon it." It is much to be hoped that this affectation will die out, and soon.

These and such as these are sufficient reasons why an exposition like that here given is timely and pertinent. It needs to be impressed on the minds of scholars that the study of the Sanskrit language is one thing, and the study of the Hindu science of grammar another and a very different thing; that while there has been a time when the latter was the way to the former, that time is now long past, and the relation of the two reversed; that the present task of the students of the grammar is to make their science accessible, account if possible for its anomalies, and determine how much and what can be extracted from it to fill out that knowledge of the language which we derive from the literature; and that the peculiar Hindu ways of grouping and viewing and naming facts familiar to us from the other related languages are an obstacle in the way of a real and fruitful comprehension of those facts as they show themselves in Sanskrit, and should be avoided. An interesting sentimental glamour, doubtless, is thrown over the language and its study by the retention of an odd classification and terminology; but that attraction is dearly purchased at the cost of a tittle of clearness and objective truth.

W. D. WHITNEY.

II.—THE JURISDICTION OF THE ATHENIANS OVER THEIR ALLIES.¹

I had occasion some time ago, in the course of my regular work, to endeavor to arrive at a clear opinion about the meaning of the first four lines of Thuc. I 77 : καὶ ἐλασσούμενοι γὰρ ἐν ταῖς ξυμβολαίαις πρὸς τοὺς ξυμμάχους δίκαις καὶ παρ' ἡμῖν αὐτοῖς ἐν τοῖς ὁμοίοις νόμοις ποιήσαντες τὰς κρίσεις φιλοδικεῖν δοκοῦμεν. So far as I could come to a conclusion by my own lights and a study of the authorities quoted or referred to in the notes, I decided that Classen—who tells us he had modified his former view in consequence of an article of Stahl's in the *Jahrbücher*—was right, at least in this respect, that the two clauses of the sentence speak of two different matters: the former referring to the judgment of such cases as came within the range of σύμβολα or commercial treaties between states, and the latter to those causes of their allies which the Athenians insisted on having tried in their own courts at Athens. I naturally felt much interest in the article which Prof. Goodwin wrote for the first number of the *American Journal of Philology*; but as soon as I had been able to form an opinion of my own I found myself wholly unable to agree with his conclusion. In particular the translation which he gives of this passage of Thucydides, leaving out of consideration the sense in which he understood the words συμβόλαιαι δίκαι, appeared to be erroneous in that it interpreted the two clauses as having respect to the same subject matter. He renders: "For even when we put ourselves at a disadvantage in business suits with our allies, and have such cases tried in our own courts, under the same laws to which we ourselves are subject, we are thought to be fond of litigation." He had, however, a true instinct in this respect that, on the assumption that the latter clause referred to the same subject matter as the former, the expression ξυμβόλαιαι δίκαι could be understood to be equivalent to δίκαι ἀπὸ ξυμβόλων only on the supposition that the suits so designated had wholly changed their character. It would have to be assumed that "the reciprocity which was the essential feature of such suits was forcibly removed, and

¹ This paper was read before the Johns Hopkins Philological Association.

the whole relation was one-sided and compulsory." He thinks it necessary to argue that the case of the murder of Herodes in Antiphon could not have been classed with *δίκαι ἀπὸ ξυμβόλων*. And so, to get rid of the difficulty, he decides that *δίκαι ξυμβόλαιαι* are not *δίκαι ἀπὸ ξυμβόλων* at all; but are to be understood of suits about *ξυμβόλαια* or business contracts. In this opinion he has the high support of Boeckh and Grote. But both these authorities are led to their conclusion by the same interpretation of the passage in question. The former gives no translation of it; but Grote renders it: "For even though we put ourselves at disadvantage in matters litigated with our allies, and though we have appointed such matters to be judged among ourselves, and under laws equal to both parties, we are represented as animated by nothing better than a love of litigation." The special contribution to the elucidation of the subject which Prof. Goodwin conceived himself to have made, consisted in the citation of two passages from Aristotle's Politics, which appeared to him to prove that Aristotle at least recognized a distinction between the two expressions. But Prof. Jowett, in a note appended to the introduction to the second volume of his Translation of Thucydides, points out with great justice that the expressions quoted from Aristotle do not contain the same phrase as we find in Thucydides, but instead of this either *δίκαι τῶν συμβολαίων* or *δίκαι περὶ συμβολαίων*, and after some discussion he concludes that the settlement of the question is not materially affected by the passages quoted by Prof. Goodwin. In this I entirely agree with him. But as regards what I think the cardinal point in the interpretation of the sentence in question, Prof. Jowett's translation leaves as much to be desired as those of Prof. Goodwin, or Grote. He renders: "For because in our suits with our allies, regulated by treaty, we do not even stand upon our rights, but have instituted the practice of deciding them at Athens and by Athenian law, we are supposed to be litigious." It will be noticed that whereas Prof. Goodwin refuses to allow that *δίκαι ξυμβόλαιαι* can be identical with *δίκαι ἀπὸ ξυμβόλων*, because then he supposes we must include under the latter term all the compulsory interferences of the Athenians in the judicial affairs of their allies, Prof. Jowett divests the the technical phrase *δίκαι ἀπὸ ξυμβόλων* of all precise meaning and makes it cover all regulations of whatever kind which brought suits of the allies to Athenian courts. Curtius also, in his History, II^d p. 218, n. 113, E. Tr., II p. 497, not only does the same thing, but offers an explanation of the way in which such a

misuse of the term may have come about. He tells us that all private disputes among the allies, except those involving trifling amounts, as well as all public and capital matters, were brought before Athenian judges; and that this state of things arose from the fact that, after the treasury of the Delian confederation had passed to Athens, the meetings of the diet entirely ceased and the Athenians occupied the place of the synod of the league; and by way of emphasizing her supremacy insisted on the allies transferring their legal business to her courts, since this, according to Greek ideas, was the most complete expression of subjection. But he further says, it is probable that the voluntary consent of the allies was, in outward appearance, obtained for this arrangement, and treaties on the subject concluded; and that in this way may be explained how the lawsuits of the allies could be counted among the class of legal cases settled according to treaties, *i. e.* with *δικαι ἀπὸ ξυμβόλων*. It was a milder way of expressing the establishment of a new relation, just as the name of allies was retained instead of subjects.

Thus Goodwin, Grote and Boeckh on the one side, and Jowett and Curtius on the other, agree in finding in the passage of Thucydides an account of a single state of things, and do not see, as I think they should have done, that Thucydides intended to refer to two sets of causes.

A few months ago I procured a recent dissertation by J. M. Stahl (Münster, 1881) in which the whole question is discussed in the light not only of the passages in the authors cited by Prof. Goodwin and others but of several inscriptions. It is true that most of these which Stahl adduces are referred to by Prof. Jowett in the note I have quoted. Still to me Stahl's essay furnished just what I wanted to give precision to the interpretation of our passage of Thucydides, and I have thought it may be of interest to this Association to hear a short account of the whole matter as it now appears in the light thrown from these recently discovered sources on the statements found in the authors.

It is necessary, first of all, to consider the designations applied by Thucydides to the various members of the Athenian alliance. In VI 85, 2 he clearly discriminates three classes of them. The Athenian ambassador Euphemus, speaking at Camarina, divides the Athenian subject allies, *ὑπήκοοι*, into—

A. Those who were independent except in so far as they supplied ships: *νεῶν παροκωχῆ αὐτόνομοι*. In VII 57 these are spoken of

as ναῦς παρέχοντες αὐτόνομοι, and as ναυσὶ καὶ οὐ φόρῳ ὑπήκοοι. At the time of this speech, 415, only the Chians and the Methymnaeans were in this position. In III 10, 6; II 1, 1, the Mytilenaeans, who were then in this class, speak of themselves as αὐτόνομοι δὴ ὄντες.

B. Those who were under a harder control and had to pay money, τοὺς δὲ πολλοὺς χρημάτων βιαιότερον φόρῳ (sc. ἐξηγούμεθα). The great majority of the allies were in this condition; and they are variously described as ὑποτελεῖς, II 9, 4; ὑποτελεῖς φόρου, VII 57, 4; or ὑποχείριοι, III, II, 1.

Outside these two classes of ὑπήκοοι are placed—

C. ἄλλους πάνν ἐλευθέρως ξυμμαχοῦντας, i. e. those who came into the Athenian alliance on independent terms after it was formed, as the Corcyraeans. These are called οἱ ἀπὸ ξυμμαχίας αὐτόνομοι, VII 57, 3, and simply οἱ αὐτόνομοι in VI 69, 3.

It is with the second of these classes, ὑποχείριοι, that we are chiefly here concerned, as those over whom the Athenians exercised complete control. They were not only careful to see that no constitutional changes were made adverse to their supremacy, but sometimes determined the form of their constitution and made them subject to the Athenian law courts. The first class were only so far despoiled of their liberty that they had to follow Athenian lead. The Mytilenaeans say, indeed, (III 10, 6) that they are ἐλεύθεροι τῷ ὀνόματι, but they go on to explain that they mean by this that they are forced to aid in the enslavement of other Greeks, which was not contemplated in the original terms of the league against the barbarians. These indeed, as, well as the absolutely autonomous allies, may have had σύμβολα or commercial treaties with the Athenians; but it is not to them that allusion is made in our passage of Thucydides, but only to the subject and tributary class, who are represented as finding the Athenian regulations in regard to σύμβολα and other judicial business a serious ground of complaint. To understand their grievances we must first ascertain what was the nature of δίκαι ἀπὸ συμβόλων. The most important passage on this subject is that so often cited in the oration *de Halonneso*, 9-14: ἔτι περὶ συμβόλων φησὶ πεπομφέναι πρὸς ὑμᾶς τοὺς ποιησομένους, ταῦτα δὲ κύρια ἔσσεσθαι οὐκ ἐπειδὴν ἐν τῷ δικαστηρίῳ τῷ παρ' ὑμῖν κυρωθῇ, ὥσπερ ὁ νόμος κελεύει, ἀλλ' ἐπειδὴν ὡς ἑαυτὸν ἐπανενεχθῇ, ἐφέσιμον τὴν παρ' ὑμῶν γενομένην γνῶσιν ὡς ἑαυτὸν ποιούμενος. βούλεται γὰρ ὑμῶν τοῦτο προλαβεῖν καὶ ὁμολογούμενον ἐν τοῖς συμβόλοις καταστήσας, ὅτι τῶν περὶ Ποτίδαιαν γεγενημένων ἀδικημάτων οὐδὲν ἐγκαλεῖτ' αὐτῷ ὡς ἀδικούμενοι, ἀλλὰ βεβαιοῦτε δικαίως αὐτὴν ἐκείνον καὶ λαβεῖν καὶ κεκτῆσθαι . . . ἐπεὶ ὅτι γε συμβόλων

οὐδὲν δέονται Μακεδόνες πρὸς Ἀθηναίους ὁ παρεληλυθὼς ὑμῖν χρόνος τεκμήριον γενέσθω. οὔτε γὰρ Ἀμύντας ὁ πατὴρ ὁ Φιλίππου οὐθ' οἱ ἄλλοι βασιλεῖς οὐδεπώποτε σύμβολα ἐποίησαντο πρὸς τὴν πόλιν τὴν ἡμετέραν. καίτοι γε πλείους γε ἦσαν αἱ ἐπιμιξίαι τότε πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἢ νῦν εἰσιν· ἐφ' ἡμῖν γὰρ ἦν ἡ Μακεδονία καὶ φόρους ἡμῖν ἔφερον, καὶ τοῖς ἐμπορίοις τότε μᾶλλον ἢ νῦν ἡμεῖς τοῖς ἐκεῖ κἀκείνοι τοῖς παρ' ἡμῖν ἐχρῶντο, καὶ ἐμπορικαὶ δίκαι οὐκ ἦσαν, ὥσπερ νῦν, ἀκριβεῖς, αἱ κατὰ μῆνα, ποιούσαι μηδὲν δεῖσθαι συμβόλων τοὺς τοσοῦτον ἀλλήλων ἀπέχοντας. ἀλλ' ὅμως, οὐδενὸς τοιοῦτον ὄντος τότε, οὐκ ἐλυσιστελεῖ σύμβολα ποιησαμένους οὔτ' ἐκ Μακεδονίας πλεῖν Ἀθήναζε δίκας ληψομένους, οὐθ' ἡμῖν εἰς Μακεδονίαν, ἀλλ' ἡμεῖς τε τοῖς ἐκεῖ νομίμοις ἐκεῖνοί τε τοῖς παρ' ἡμῖν τὰς δίκας ἐλάμβανον.

I may remark here in passing that Stahl, who comments at length on this passage, does not even notice the interpretation, which Prof. Goodwin defends, of the words ταῦτα δὲ κύρια ἔσεσθαι οὐκ ἐπειδὴν ἐν τῷ δικαστηρίῳ τῷ παρ' ὑμῖν κυρωθῇ, ὥσπερ ὁ νόμος κελεύει, ἀλλ' ἐπειδὴν ὡς ἑαυτὸν ἐπανενεχθῇ, making ταῦτα refer not to the σύμβολα which have just been named, but to legal decisions rendered under them. It seems to me that the explanation which Prof. Goodwin rejects is perfectly satisfactory. Nothing could be more natural than that the provisions of a proposed commercial treaty should be submitted to the scrutiny of a Heliastic body analogous to that which, under the name of νομοθέται, decided whether an old law should be abrogated and a new one instituted for it. I see that Meier and Schoemann in their explanation of the passage, refer to this analogy. The orator might with great justice protest against Philip's demand that in a commercial treaty to be made with him the established order of proceeding should be violated.

From an attentive examination of this passage it appears, (1) that ξύμβολα were agreements by which between the citizens of the contracting states there was reciprocity of suing and being sued: (2) that such agreements were ratified by a Heliastic court: (3) that they had the same sphere as δίκαι ἐμπορικαί: (4) that they were held in the courts of the defendant's city, *i. e. causam sequi forum rei*: (5) that the laws decisive of cases held under them were not those of the adjudging city, but laws made binding by the ξύμβολα on those who sued under them. It may be inferred also that in the δίκαι ἐμπορικαί, by which parties must sue in default of ξύμβολα, the suit would be held where the contract was made; *i. e., causam sequi forum contractus*, and not *forum rei*, as with δίκαι ἀπὸ ξυμβόλων, and that, therefore, they could only be maintained, for instance, against an Athenian on a contract made in Macedonia if the Athenian were caught in Macedonia. We learn from [Andoc.] IV

18,¹ that *ξύβολα* contained a special provision that a freeman should be exempt from arrest; and from this we may infer that such arrest in order to secure trial was lawful if not forbidden by a *ξύβολον*. And the reason is plain; for whereas *δίκαι ἀπὸ ξυμβόλων* provided for the maintenance of suits in the defendant's city, *δίκαι ἐμπορικαί* could be prosecuted only if the defendant were caught in the country of the plaintiff.

The first Inscription which Stahl cites (C. I. A. IV 61a, Hicks, p. 111) is one which contains portions of a decree, passed in 409, prescribing the conditions under which Selymbria, which had been captured by Alcibiades, was restored to the Athenian alliance. The part of it used by Stahl is unfortunately marred by gaps which are supplied differently by himself and by Kirchhoff. It seems, however, to establish sufficiently the point for which he cites it, viz.: that *ξύβολα* contained provisions by which not only could individual citizens, A and B, of the contracting states sue one another, but suits could be maintained between a state and an individual, ἢ ἰδιώτῃ πρὸς τὸ κοινὸν ἢ κοινῇ πρὸς ἰδιώτην. Stahl's object in referring to this is to show under what circumstances a resort to an *ἐκκλητος πόλις* or city of appeal might be reasonably allowed. For he agrees with Prof. Goodwin in rejecting as entirely untenable and as unsupported by a shred of real evidence the statement of Meier and Schoemann that in all cases of *δίκαι ἀπὸ ξυμβόλων* the defeated party could appeal to the courts of his own state, or if defeated in the courts of his own state could appeal to those of his antagonists. Prof. Goodwin supposes that *ξύβολα* regularly contained the specification of a *πόλις ἐκκλητος* to which it was agreed that disputes between the citizens of the contracting states should be referred, when they could not be settled by the tribunals recognized in the treaty. Stahl, however, thinks that the services of such a city of appeal would be provided for only when a suit was brought by an individual citizen of the one state against the other state. As it could hardly be expected, *e. g.*, that an Athenian court would give judgment against Athens, the rule of *causam sequi forum rei* would in this case lead probably to a failure of justice; and to such suits it is not unlikely that the passages, which Prof. Goodwin quotes, about a *πόλις ἐκκλητος* are to be referred.

The next Inscription to which Stahl refers is a decree relating to a treaty between Athens and the people of Phaselis (C. I. A. II

¹ καὶ πρὸς μὲν τὰς ἄλλας πόλεις ἐν τοῖς συμβόλοις συντιθέμεθα μὴ ἐξεῖναι μήθ' εἰρξαι μήτε δῆσαι τὸν ἐλεύθερον.

11, Hicks, p. 127). Its date is somewhere between the battle of Cnidus (394) and the peace of Antalcidas (387) cir. B. C. 390. The gaps are unfortunately supplied differently by Köhler and by Stahl. Still some inferences can be drawn from it. First it is stated that a suit on a contract made *at Athens* with a Phaselitan must be tried at Athens before the Polemarch *καθάπερ Χίοις*: and from this it is seen that Chios had no *ξύμβολα* with Athens: for we are expressly told by Pollux, who no doubt follows Aristotle, that *δίκαι ἀπὸ ξυμβόλων* were under the *ἡγεμονία* of the Thesmothetae. The decree goes on to state that for all other contracts made with Phaselitans suits shall follow the terms of the *ξύμβολα*, *i. e.* shall follow *forum rei*. It seems then that the Phaselitans in suits based on contracts made at Athens were to avail themselves of ordinary *δίκαι ἐμπορικαί*, which would be decided by the general laws of Athens and not by the particular stipulations of *ξύμβολα*, while for all others the rules of the special *ξύμβολα* made with them were to prevail.¹ From this it is seen that in some cases *ξύμβολα* referred to a part only and not to the whole of commercial cases which might arise between Athenians and citizens of other contracting states. It is important too to notice that these suits which are thus expressly excepted from the provisions of the *ξύμβολα* are to be brought before the polemarch, who occupied the same relation to *ξένοι* as the *ἄρχων ἐπώνυμος* did to citizens. The existence of complete *ξύμβολα* gave to the citizens of the foreign state exactly the same rights as were enjoyed by the citizens of Athens in all matters covered by the treaty: as is shown by a passage of Arist. Pol. III 1, 4, quoted by Prof. Goodwin and also by Stahl, in which Aristotle says that equality in regard to suing and being sued does not constitute citizenship; for this *ὑπάρχει καὶ τοῖς ἀπὸ συμβόλων κοινωνοῦσιν*: and he goes on to say that even the resident aliens, *μέτοικοι*, do not possess this right fully, but must employ a *προστάτης*: from which it may be inferred with certainty that in *δίκαι ἀπὸ ξυμβόλων* the foreign plaintiff appeared in person as if he were a citizen. Stahl

¹ A. Fränkel, Diss. de condic. Soc. Athen. p. 71, argues from this decree that the rule of *ξύμβολα* was that *causam sequi forum contractus*. But it is evident that the decree makes a special exception to the rule in the case of the Phaselitans, as regards contracts made at Athens, in this particular assimilating them to the Chians; and it may be inferred that for the latter suits also on contracts made elsewhere than at Athens followed *forum contractus*; since unless this difference existed there would have been no reason for making a distinction between them and the people of Phaselis.

quotes next an inscription (C. I. A. IV 11, 96) in reference to the Mytilenaeans after their reduction in 427. Jowett refers to it also; but as it is much mutilated prefers to found no conclusion upon it. He says, however, that it seems to indicate what Stahl infers from it, viz.: that the Athenians had *δίκαι ἀπὸ ξυμβόλων* with the people of Mytilene both before and after the revolt; that is, not only when Mytilene was one of the autonomous allies, but also after it had been forced to receive Athenian cleruchs. It may be that it was under these circumstances that *ἐπίσκοποι* were sent to preside over trials held under the *ξύμβολα*. The words *πρὸ τούτου τοῦ χρόνου* are unfortunately in brackets; but as Stahl observes, the verb *ἦσαν*, of which the first three letters remain, suffices to show that the agreements spoken of existed before the revolt. Our inscriptions, therefore, have shown us *δίκαι ἀπὸ ξυμβόλων* with Selymbria, a subject and tributary ally, and with Mytilene, at first one of the autonomous states and afterwards a cleruchial district, during the time of the former Athenian alliance.

The often quoted passage of Antiphon, V 78, is cited by Prof. Goodwin, Jowett and Stahl.¹ Here Stahl accepts from A. Fränkel the suggestion that before the last words a clause should be inserted such as *τοὺς δὲ εἰς τοὺς ξυμμάχους ἀπαλλαχθέντας τοὺς ὑμετέροους*. For he argues justly that the words *τοὺς μὲν εἰς τὴν ἡπειρον ἰόντας κτέ.* imply a clause with *τοὺς δέ*—this Reiske noticed—and that the expression *ἐν τοῖς πολεμίοις τοῖς ὑμετέροις* is incompatible with the notion that persons so described could have had *ξύμβολα* with the Athenians, though Prof. Goodwin follows Boeckh in thinking this possible. There must, therefore, have been allied cities in that quarter with whom the Athenians had *ξύμβολα*, after the reduction of Mytilene, to which time this speech has reference; and as there is no reason to suppose that the speaker is thinking specially of Chios and Methymna—which were the only remaining independent cities—and the other cities were either tributary or hostile, it is a fair inference that *ξύμβολα* existed between Athens and some, at least, of her tributary allies during the Peloponnesian war, which has been already shown to be probable on other grounds. The citations from the grammarians which are made by Prof. Goodwin are brought forward also by Stahl. Bekk. Anect. p. 436, 1: Ἀθηναῖοι

¹ εἰ δ' ἐν Αἰνῷ χωροφίλει, τοῦτο [ποιεῖ Reiske] οὐκ ἀποστερῶν γε τῶν εἰς τὴν πόλιν ἑαυτὸν οὐδενὸς οὐδ' ἐτέρας πόλεως πολίτης γεγενημένος, ὥσπερ ἐτέρους ὁρῶ τοὺς μὲν εἰς τὴν ἡπειρον ἰόντας καὶ οἰκοῦντας ἐν τοῖς πολεμίοις τοῖς ὑμετέροις . . . καὶ δίκας ἀπὸ ξυμβόλων ὑμῖν δικάζομένους.

ἀπὸ συμβόλων ἐδίκασον τοῖς ὑπηκόοις· οὕτως Ἀριστοτέλης. Poll. VIII 63, ἀπὸ συμβόλων δὲ δίκη ἦν ὅτε οἱ σύμμαχοι ἐδικάζοντο. Hesych. ἀπὸ συμβόλων δικάζειν· ἐδίκασον Ἀθηναῖοι ἀπὸ συμβόλων τοῖς ὑπηκόοις· καὶ τοῦτο ἦν χαλεπὸν. These expressions, which probably all come from Aristotle, are understood by Stahl to assert generally the existence of *σύμβολα* between Athens and her subject allies; and he does not admit, what Prof. Goodwin suggests, in this following Grote, that possibly they may have reference to the second maritime alliance of the Athenians of 378, though the term *ὑπήκοοι* is confessedly inapplicable to its members; or that they may require to be limited to the members of the old alliance who were independent of tribute and as long as they remained so. He does not, however, touch upon what seems to me the chief difficulty in accepting them in their strict sense of the relation between the Athenians and those allies with whom they had *σύμβολα*. We have seen that such agreements called for reciprocity; and that trials held under them were maintained in the courts of the defendant's city. If, therefore, they were observed with perfect equity, it ought to be as true to say that ἐδίκασον οἱ ὑπήκοοι ἀπὸ συμβόλων τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις as that ἐδίκασον Ἀθηναῖοι τοῖς ὑπηκόοις. It would no doubt practically come to pass that most of such suits would, even by the terms of the treaties, have to be tried in Athenian courts. For in most cases the Athenians would be the defendants. The feelings with which the dominant Athenian Demos, as a whole, regarded the subject allies could hardly fail to exhibit themselves in the dealings of individual Athenians with those with whom they had commercial relations; and so it would come to pass that in the great majority of such cases it would be the citizen of an allied state who was the plaintiff, and he must necessarily, therefore, sue in an Athenian court. We may consider also that suits brought against Athenians by citizens of any one of the subject cities would all be tried at Athens; whereas the suits brought by Athenians against any citizens of their tributary states would be tried one at Rhodes, another at Phaselis, another at Samos, and so on. The judicial range, therefore, of the Athenian courts must have greatly surpassed that of the courts of any one of the allies, perhaps of all of them together; and thus, even without any formal infraction of the reciprocity implied by the existence of *σύμβολα*, the impression may easily have come to exist, which the statements quoted from the grammarians express, that it was the Athenians who decided, in accordance with the terms of the several *σύμβολα*,

the commercial suits of their subjects. Stahl comments on the words of Hesychius, καὶ τοῦτο ἦν χαλεπόν. This expression certainly can have no reference to the second alliance. It was, he says, possible and even likely that, though the σύμβολα which the Athenians had with their allies in the fifth century, assumed and called for perfect reciprocity between the contracting cities, in actual working the citizens of the dominant city would get an advantage, and that the Athenians in negotiating such treaties would see to it that the terms were such as to conduce mainly to their own interests. Still they must have felt that in the long run their advantage would be mainly secured by augmenting and rendering safe their commercial relations; and that this result would be greatly promoted by facilitating the equitable settlement of commercial disputes. On the whole then, we seem to have adequate warrant for believing that the Athenians had such commercial treaties with at least several of the subject members of their first alliance.

But we have now to consider the other points in which Athenian courts had control of the affairs of citizens of the subject states. The passages in the authors which throw any light on this question are few and inadequate. The writer of the tract *de republica Atheniensium*, c. 1, §16-18 insists upon the advantages the Athenians derived from this jurisdiction and the hardship it was to the allies; but he does not define its extent. We learn, indeed, from Antiphon, V 47,¹ that a city in the position of Mytilene could not inflict the penalty of death: and the case of the parodist Hegemon which Prof. Goodwin cites after Boeckh from Athenaeus was most likely a γραφή ὑβρεως and so involved a serious punishment. This is nearly all that we can learn from the authors. But much more can be elicited from the inscription which records the decree defining the status of Chalcis after its reduction by Pericles in 445 (C. I. A. I suppl. p. 10, Hicks, p. 33). This decree is in three portions moved by as many proposers. The last part, which was proposed by Archestratus, contains the words: τὰς δὲ εὐθύνας Χαλκιδεῦσι κατὰ σφῶν αὐτῶν εἶναι ἐν Χαλκίδι καθάπερ Ἀθήνησιν Ἀθηναίοις, ἡ πλὴν φυγῆς καὶ θανάτου καὶ ἀτιμίας. περὶ δὲ τούτων ἔφεσιν εἶναι Ἀθήναζε ἐς τὴν ἡλιαίαν τὴν τῶν θεσμοθετῶν κατὰ τὸ ψήφισμα τοῦ δήμου. Mr. Hicks interprets this in his marginal comment: "the Chalkidian magistrates accountable to their own courts, with certain exceptions." That is, he understands εἶθυναί in the sense it ordinarily bore in Attic constitutional law. But it is much more likely that the word is here

¹ ὃ οὐδὲ πόλει ἐξεστίν, ἀνεὺς Ἀθηναίων οὐδένα θανάτῳ ζημιῶσαι.

used in a more general meaning, as defined by Hesych. εὐθύνας · τιμωρίας, δίκας, τὸ δοῦναι λόγον ἐφ' ἐκάστῳ ἁμαρτήματι, and recognized by Meier and Schoemann, p. 215. See also Ar. Vesp. 571; Pl. Prot. 326d; and εὐθύνειν in Thuc. I 95, 5. Stahl calls attention to the words κατὰ σφῶν αὐτῶν as indicating this meaning, since it should read κατὰ τῶν ἀρξάντων if reference were made only to the accounts of magistrates. The character of the offences which were to be sent for trial on appeal to Athens is determined by the penalties to which they were liable, viz.: φυγή, θάνατος, ἀτιμία. And from this it will follow that all γραφαί or public suits, in which an offence against the state was charged, whether prosecuted by an injured citizen or by one who brought an action against the wrong-doer merely from public spirit, would admit of appeal to the Athenian courts, in case the defendant had been convicted in the courts of Chalcis. Stahl thinks that also all those δίκαι or private actions, which are characterized as κατὰ τινος (*actiones ex delicto*), i. e. those in which the defendant was liable not merely to make good a damage caused to the individual prosecutor, but also to suffer some penalty inflicted by the state, are to be included in the class of appealable actions. He is led to this conclusion by the consideration that we have evidence that certain degrees of ἀτιμία were inflicted in actions for false witness and for theft. It appears to me that in this he is assuming too close a similarity between the technicalities of Attic procedure and what may have prevailed at Chalcis. And without including either class of δίκαι, the range of appealable cases would have been sufficiently large. The list of γραφαί given in Meier and Schoemann comprises some fifty causes of action; and if it may be taken as probable that a considerable number of these had special reference to peculiarities of Athenian constitutional law, still a large part of them must have had their *analogia* in any civilized Hellenic state. It is at any rate clear that whatever may have been the technical form of the action, a defendant who was condemned in a Chalcidian court to death, exile or disfranchisement, had a right of appeal to a court at Athens: and it naturally follows that all cases in which a lesser penalty was imposed and all suits for non-fulfilment of obligations, *ex contractu*, i. e., δίκαι πρὸς τινα were left to the final decision of the Chalcidian courts.

But the earlier portion also of the Chalcidian ψήφισμα, which was adopted on the motion of Diognetus, gives us additional information. It states the substance of the oath which was to be taken by the βουλὴ and the δικάσται of Athens in reference to their dealings

with Chalcis. After declaring in general terms that the place shall not be destroyed the oath proceeds: οὐδὲ ιδιώτην οὐδένα ἀτιμώσω οὐδὲ φνυγῇ ζημιώσω οὐδὲ ξυλλήψομαι οὐδὲ ἀποκτενῶ οὐδὲ χρήματα ἀφαιρήσομαι ἀκρίτου οὐδενὸς ἄνευ τοῦ δήμου τοῦ Ἀθηναίων. Now here Mr. Hicks, in his commentary, says that these provisions apply to the Athenian dicasts when trying a case brought to them from Chalcis. But Stahl is certainly right in his opinion that they have an entirely different meaning. The cases heretofore spoken of are those which were to be brought before Athenian courts on appeal from courts in Chalcis, where the sentence of disfranchisement, exile, or death had been pronounced. But in the provisions now treated of we have the additional penalties of imprisonment and fine referred to; and Stahl points out also that the words used in the resolution moved by Archestratus: τὰς εὐθύνας Χαλκιδεῦσι κατὰ σφῶν αὐτῶν εἶναι ἐν Χαλκίδι, imply that the words employed in that of Diognetus must refer to actions commenced elsewhere and not between Chalcidians. These can only be actions between Athenians and Chalcidians; and he infers, therefore, that, as before, the penalties named decided what classes of actions might be appealed to Athens, so here the actions against Chalcidians in which Athens is to have original jurisdiction, are in like manner determined by the punishments which they could result in. The words οὐ χρήματα ἀφαιρήσομαι do not refer to confiscation of goods only, but also to the imposition of fines, and so evidently apply to cases of private injury, δίκαι κατὰ τινας. So the words οὐ ξυλλήψομαι are probably to be understood of placing in confinement—not for the purpose of securing the accused person's presence at the trial or the payment of his fine—but inflicted as a punishment. It is true we do not hear much of imprisonment as a punishment; but Meier and Schoemann, p. 745, refer to Dem. 24, 114, who says that a person convicted of theft in a private suit, besides having to pay to the plaintiff twice the value of the thing stolen, might at the discretion of the judges be punished in the way of a προστίμησης by confinement (δεσμός) for five days and five nights, ὅπως ὀρῶεν ἅπαντες αὐτὸν δεδεμένον, which is probably to be understood of the stocks. As to δίκαι πρὸς τινα arising between Athenians and Chalcidians, as these would be almost always, if not invariably, on mercantile disputes, and it has been shown that with some allies at least the Athenians had σύμβολα for such questions, Stahl thinks that it was so with Chalcis; and thus we have provision made for all private actions as well as public ones.

There remains still in this decree one expression of which, it seems to me, Stahl has given the correct explanation. The oath says that the penalties mentioned shall not be exacted ἀκρίτου οὐδενὸς ἄνευ τοῦ δήμου τοῦ Ἀθηναίων. This seems at first sight to imply that every accused Chalcidian should have a fair trial, unless the people decreed that he should not have one. But it does not need many words to show that the Chalcidians would not have much to be thankful for if this was the intention of the oath. Stahl argues that the words ἄνευ τοῦ δήμου τοῦ Ἀθηναίων refer to cases of εἰσαγγελία or information laid before the Senate or the assembled people. In such cases the assembly either decided itself, and directly, on the guilt or innocence of the accused person, or voted that the matter should be referred to one of the heliastic courts. The meaning, therefore, of the words quoted will be that in all matters which are brought before the courts, whether by the act of an individual accuser or by vote of the assembly the defendant shall have a fair trial; in cases of εἰσαγγελία in which the assembly itself condemned, the senators and judges who take this oath, being themselves members of the ἐκκλησία, would not be under any obligation by the terms of this oath to vote for the acquittal of the accused person, but might, if they saw fit, condemn him. It is assumed in this interpretation that ἀκριτος may mean 'without a trial formally regular'; and to illustrate this meaning Stahl quotes Pseud.-Plat. Axioch. 368e, where Theramenes and his partisans are said to have procured irregularly the destruction of the commanders at Arginusai: προἰδρους ἐγκαθέτους ὑφέντες κατεχειροτόνησαν τῶν ἀνδρῶν ἀκριτον θάνατον. There is a passage in Lysias, XII 81, 82, which Stahl does not cite, but which illustrates, I think, still better this use of ἀκριτος. Lysias argues that the circumstances in which Eratosthenes is placed on his trial are far more favorable than he deserved as one of the Thirty. οὗτος μὲν γὰρ κατήγορος καὶ δικαστὴς αὐτὸς ἦν τῶν κρινομένων (Reiske, Scheibe, Rauchenstein), ἡμεῖς δὲ νυνὶ εἰς κατηγορίαν καὶ ἀπολογίαν καθέσταμεν. καὶ οὗτοι μὲν τοὺς οὐδὲν ἀδικούντας ἀκρίτους ἀπέκτειναν, ὑμεῖς δὲ τοὺς ἀπολέσαντας τὴν πόλιν κατὰ τὸν νόμον ἀξιοῦτε κρίνειν. Here 'those who have just been spoken of as κρινόμενοι are said to have been put to death, ἀκριτοι, and this term is opposed to κατὰ τὸν νόμον κρίνειν.

Stahl further remarks that if he is right in interpreting the words in question of the process called εἰσαγγελία, we have in this inscription the earliest allusion to it. The so-called νόμος εἰσαγγελτικός is supposed not to have been earlier than the archonship of Eukleides;

but that law probably summed up the cases in which experience had shown that *εισαγγελία* was a necessary supplement to the regular provisions of the laws, in order to bring to trial serious offenses which, perhaps, violated no particular law, but required immediate punishment. In the case of the Chalcidians these would probably be acts which tended to the damage of the Athenian state or league, incitement to revolt, etc.

Stahl now proceeds to discuss the passage before referred to in the tract *de republica Atheniensium*, I 14-17. 14: *περὶ δὲ τῶν συμμάχων, ὅτι ἐκπλέοντες συκοφαντοῦσιν, ὥς δοκοῦσι, καὶ μειοῦσι (μισοῦσι D.) τοὺς χρηστοὺς, γινώσκοντες ὅτι μισεῖσθαι μὲν ἀνάγκη τὸν ἄρχοντα ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀρχομένου· εἰ δὲ ἰσχύσουσιν οἱ πλούσιοι καὶ οἱ χρηστοὶ (ἰσχυροὶ D.) ἐν ταῖς πόλεσιν, ὀλίγιστον χρόνον ἢ ἀρχὴ ἔσται τοῦ δήμου τοῦ Ἀθηνησι.* διὰ ταῦτ' οὖν τοὺς μὲν χρηστοὺς ἀτιμοῦσι καὶ χρήματα ἀφαιροῦνται καὶ ἐξελεύνουσι καὶ ἀποκτείνουσι, τοὺς δὲ πονηροὺς αὖξουσιν. οἱ δὲ χρηστοὶ Ἀθηναίων τοὺς χρηστοὺς ἐν ταῖς συμμάχισι πόλεσι σφύζουσι, γινώσκοντες ὅτι σφίσιν ἀγαθόν ἐστί τοὺς βελτίστους σφύζειν αἰεὶ ἐν ταῖς πόλεσιν. 15. *εἴποι δέ τις ἂν ὅτι ἰσχύς ἐστὶν αὕτη Ἀθηναίων, ἔαν οἱ σύμμαχοι δυνατοὶ ᾧσι χρήματα εἰσφέρειν.* τοῖς δὲ δημοτικοῖς δοκεῖ μείζον ἀγαθὸν εἶναι τὰ τῶν συμμάχων χρήματα ἢ τὰ ἑκάστου Ἀθηναίων ἔχειν, ἐκείνους δὲ ὅσον ζῆν καὶ ἐργάζεσθαι, ἀδυνάτους ὄντας ἐπιβουλεύειν. 16. *δοκεῖ δὲ ὁ δῆμος ὁ Ἀθηναίων καὶ ἐν τῷδε κακῶς βουλευέσθαι ὅτι τοὺς συμμάχους ἀναγκάζουσι πλεῖν ἐπὶ δίκας Ἀθήναζε.* οἱ δὲ ἀντιλογίζονται ὅσα ἐν τούτῳ ἔνι ἀγαθὰ τῷ δήμῳ τῷ Ἀθηναίων. *πρῶτον μὲν ἀπὸ τῶν πρυτανείων τὸν μισθὸν δι' ἐνιαυτοῦ λαμβάνειν· εἴτ' οἴκοι καθήμενοι ἀνευ νεῶν ἑκπλου διοικοῦσι τὰς πόλεις τὰς συμμαχίδας, καὶ τοὺς μὲν τοῦ δήμου σφύζουσι, τοὺς δὲ ἐναντίους ἀπολλύουσιν ἐν τοῖς δικαστηρίοις. εἰ δ' οἴκοι εἶχον ἕκαστοι τὰς δίκας, ἅτε ἀχθόμενοι Ἀθηναίοις τούτους ἂν σφῶν αὐτῶν ἀπώλλυσαν, οἵτινες φίλοι μάλιστα ἦσαν Ἀθηναίων τῷ δήμῳ.* 17. *πρὸς δὲ τούτοις ὁ δῆμος τῶν Ἀθηναίων τάδε κερδαίνει τῶν δικῶν Ἀθήνησι οὐσῶν τοῖς συμμάχοις.* πρῶτον μὲν γὰρ ἡ ἑκατοστὴ τῇ πόλει πλείων ἢ ἐν Πειραιεῖ. *ἔπειτα εἴ τῳ συνοικία ἔστιν, ἄμεινον πράττει. ἔπειτα εἴ τῳ ζεύγος ἔστιν ἢ ἀνδράποδον μισθοφοροῦν.* 18. *ἔπειτα οἱ κήρυκες ἄμεινον πράττουσι διὰ τὰς ἐπιδημίας τὰς τῶν συμμάχων.* πρὸς δὲ τούτοις εἰ μὲν μὴ ἐπὶ δίκας ἦσαν οἱ σύμμαχοι τοὺς ἐκπλέοντας Ἀθηναίων ἐτίμων ἂν μόνους, τοὺς τε στρατηγοὺς καὶ τοὺς τριηράρχους καὶ πρέσβεις· νῦν δ' ἡνάγκασται τὸν δῆμον κολακεύειν τῶν Ἀθηναίων εἰς ἕκαστος τῶν συμμάχων, γινώσκων ὅτι δεῖ μὲν ἀφικόμενον Ἀθήναζε δίκην δοῦναι καὶ λαβεῖν οὐκ ἐν ἄλλοις τισὶν ἄλλ' ἐν τῷ δήμῳ, ὅς ἐστι δὴ νόμος Ἀθήνησι· καὶ ἀντιβολῆσαι ἀναγκάζεται ἐν τοῖς δικαστηρίοις καὶ εἰσιόντος τοῦ ἐπιλαμβάνεσθαι τῆς χειρός. διὰ τοῦτο οὖν οἱ σύμμαχοι δοῦλοι τοῦ δήμου τῶν Ἀθηναίων καθεστᾶσι μᾶλλον.

In the first place the words *ἐκπλέοντες συκοφαντοῦσι* indicate that the cases the writer speaks of first are actions brought by the

Athenians against allies, and not ones arising among the citizens of an allied city themselves; and these, we have seen, were regularly tried at Athens. The punishments here said to be inflicted are the same, and are expressed also in nearly the same words, as in the Chalcidian decree. They are said here ἀτιμοῦν τοὺς χρηστούς, χρήματα ἀφαιρεῖσθαι, ἐξελαύνειν καὶ ἀποκτείνειν. It is true there is no mention of imprisonment, συλλαμβάνειν for this seems to have been employed only in certain private causes and to a very limited extent in combination with other penalties. But we must not suppose that the writer has in view public causes only: for he says τοῖς δημοτικοῖς δοκεῖ μείζον ἀγαθὸν εἶναι τὰ τῶν συμμάχων χρήματα ἕνα ἕκαστον Ἀθηναίων ἔχειν, and this could be secured only or mainly by private suits; for in public ones (γραφαί), it was quite the exception for the accuser to derive any pecuniary benefit from the successful prosecution of his case. But, on the other hand, the last words of § 16, εἰ δ' οἱκοι εἶχον ἕκαστοι τὰς δίκας, ἅτε ἀχθόμενοι Ἀθηναίοις τούτους ἂν σφῶν αὐτῶν ἀπώλλουσιν οἱ τινες φίλοι μάλιστα ἦσαν Ἀθηναίων τῷ δήμῳ, show clearly that the cases here spoken of would, in the natural course of things, and in default of any compulsion on the part of Athens, have been tried in the courts of the allied city. Stahl calls special attention to the fact that the pronoun σφῶν αὐτῶν is used here with the implication that the disputes were among citizens of the same city, which was the meaning assigned to it in the psephism of Archestratus. That the suits thus brought before Athenian courts must have been of a grave character is shown by the words τοὺς ἐναντίους ἀπολλύουσιν ἐν τοῖς δικαστηρίοις. To this point Prof. Jowett also alludes in his reply to Prof. Goodwin, who thinks Xenophon refers only to civil suits tried by compulsion in Athenian courts, and says "it is unlikely that any criminal suits, except the more important, were carried from the subject states to the Athenian courts, and in these it was probably a matter of indifference to the accused where he was tried, as he had no expenses." "ἀπολλύουσιν," says Prof. Jowett, "means surely in this place 'they are the death of them,' not merely 'they plunder them.'" Prof. Goodwin's notion that persons in the allied cities accused of crimes would as soon be tried at Athens as at home 'because they had no expenses' seems founded on a very inadequate conception of the terrors of the heliastic courts. He is probably referring to the fact, that according to the common opinion, it was only in private causes that πρυτανεία or court-fees were paid in advance by the parties to a suit. These, however, were not heavy, and in a serious case

could not have been regarded as adding greatly to its dangers. Stahl, indeed, asserts that the present passage proves that this opinion as to the limitation of *πρυτανεία* to private suits is erroneous, and he refers to an Inscription (C. I. A. IV 22), which speaks of *πρυτανεία* being paid when we cannot suppose that only private causes are in question. Boeckh,¹ however, who was the first to lay down this rule as to *πρυτανεία* himself admits that in public causes where the accuser, if successful, would be entitled to a part of the penalty, it was natural that he should deposit the usual sum. And it does not seem to me that Prof. Goodwin is justified in inferring that in the whole passage only private suits are referred to, even if we suppose that, where the *πρυτανεία* are mentioned, the writer is thinking only of such suits. The *πρυτανεία* paid in private causes would be one source of the profit made by the Athenians; but fines and confiscations, if defendants could be plausibly condemned, would be a much more prolific branch of revenue; and, whether prosecutions were by *γραφαί*, or *δίκαι*, all the other sources of profit which the writer enumerates would be equally productive.

This passage then, of Pseud.-Xenophon, shows that the writer had in view the same two classes of causes which appeared to be implied in the Chalcidian decree; those, namely, which Athenians had with citizens of allied cities and those which, arising among the allies themselves, were tried on appeal in Athenian courts. And since this writer speaks of the allies in general, and we find that in its main features his account tallies with the arrangements of the Chalcidian decree, it is natural to infer that the detailed provisions there made were in force also in regard to the great body of the allied states. The motives too which are attributed to the Athenian demos in enforcing their jurisdiction on the allies, are seen to be substantially the same as may be inferred from the provisions of the decree. We read that *εἰ ἰσχύουσιν οἱ πλούσιοι καὶ οἱ ἰσχυροὶ (χρηστοὶ) ἐν ταῖς πόλεσιν ὀλίγιστον χρόνον ἢ ἀρχὴ ἔσται τοῦ δήμου τοῦ Ἀθήνησι. διὰ ταῦτα οὖν τοὺς μὲν χρηστοὺς ἀτιμοῦσι καὶ χρήματα ἀφαιροῦνται καὶ ἐξελαύνουσι καὶ ἀποκτείνουσι τοὺς δὲ πονηροὺς αἰξουσιν.* Here we are told that it was the rich and oligarchical citizens of the allied states that the Athenians brought suits against, and having got them before their courts visited them with disfranchisement, fines, banishment, or death; and that they did this in order to prevent the growth in the dependent cities of that element which was naturally

¹ A. Fränkel, p. 34, successfully refutes this opinion of Boeckh's.

hostile to the ascendancy of the Athenian democracy: and that they exerted their influence to exalt the popular party. We find the other side of this policy in the decree. We see in it that any citizens of Chalcis who were condemned by a Chalcidian court to disfranchisement, exile, or death, were entitled to appeal to an Athenian court. With the feelings of the subject states, as described by [Xen.], it would be the leaders of the popular and philo-Athenian party who would be exposed to such serious attacks in the Chalcidian courts as would involve these penalties; and the Athenians were naturally anxious that those who were disposed to maintain their supremacy should not be deprived of their power to give effect to their wishes by losing their civic rights or by being put out of the way by banishment or death. By crushing, therefore, the rich and oligarchical in their own courts and by preventing the leaders of the popular party being treated in the same way in the Chalcidian courts, the Athenians take the most efficient means of keeping up their ascendancy; τοὺς μὲν τοῦ δήμου σφύζουσι, τοὺς δὲ ἐναντίους ἀπολλύουσιν ἐν τοῖς δικαστηρίοις· εἰ δὲ οἴκοι εἶχον ἕκαστοι τὰς δίκας, ἅτε ἀχθόμενοι Ἀθηναίοις, τούτους ἂν σφῶν αὐτῶν ἀπώλλυσαν, οἵτινες φίλοι μάλιστα ἦσαν Ἀθηναίων τῷ δήμῳ. It may probably be considered that the evident correspondence between the general statements of [Xen.] and the inferences legitimately drawn from the decree, is evidence enough that substantially the same relations subsisted between Athens and her subject allies in general as those that have been deduced. There is, however, one important respect in which the state of things disclosed by [Xen.] seems to differ from that contemplated in the decree. We have nothing hinted about appeal. The expression of the writer is quite general—εἰ δὲ οἴκοι εἶχον ἕκαστοι τὰς δίκας—and the natural implication of the words is that all serious suits were tried at Athens. The date of this treatise on the Athenian state cannot be fixed with exactness. Boeckh places it cir. B. C. 425. Now the Chalcidian decree is dated B. C. 445. We have, therefore, an interval of some twenty years during which the Athenian system of controlling their allies had been developing itself. Stahl suggests, with great probability, that by their mode of dealing with cases appealed to their courts the Athenians had brought it about that a larger and larger number of such suits were sent in the first instance to Athens for adjudication; so that it came gradually to be the rule that all cases involving serious penalties were sent directly to Athens; and thus, there being no longer practically any use made of the permission

to appeal, the writer of the tract may well have left it unmentioned. Stahl is careful, however, to admit the probability that the degree in which these regulations were carried out in practice would depend on various circumstances; and that in the case of the more distant allies or the more unimportant ones, the Athenians would be likely to content themselves with hearing such cases as might be sent to Athens on appeal, leaving the majority to be settled by the local courts. But whatever differences may have existed in practice, it is likely that all the tributary allies stood in substantially the same formal relation to the ruling city; for the tendency of things must have been that described by the Athenian speaker in Th. I 75, 3, where the motives are stated which led the Athenians to change their free *ἡγεμονία* into an *ἀρχή*. ἐξ αὐτοῦ τοῦ ἔργου κατηναγκάσθημεν τὸ πρῶτον προαγαγεῖν αὐτὴν ἐς τόδε, μάλιστα μὲν ὑπὸ δέους, ἔπειτα δὲ καὶ τιμῆς, ὕστερον καὶ ὠφελείας. We know from the case of Potidaea, described in the first book of Thucydides, that it was not necessary that a tribute-paying ally should have actually taken any steps towards asserting its complete independence to cause the Athenians to decide to reduce it to subjection. The fear that such attempt may be made is enough: the Athenians are said, in this case (I 56, 2), to have acted as they did δέισαντες μὴ ἀποστῶσιν . . . τοὺς τε ἄλλους ἐπὶ Θράκης ξυναποστήσωσι ξυμμάχους . . . βουλόμενοι προκαταλαμβάνειν τῶν πόλεων τὰς ἀποστάσεις. And in the speech of the Mytilenaeans (III 11, 6), the speakers say that they had maintained their independence so far ἀπὸ θεραπείας τοῦ τε κοινοῦ αὐτῶν καὶ τῶν αἰὲ προσεστώτων· οὐ μέντοι ἐπὶ πολὺ γ' ἂν ἐδοκοῦμεν δυνηθῆναι, εἰ μὴ ὁ πόλεμος ὅδε κατέστη, παραδείγμασι χρώμενοι τοῖς ἐς τοὺς ἄλλους.

We may now sum up the results that have been reached:

(1) Suits arising out of commercial dealings between Athenians and their allies, *ex contractu*, were decided ἀπὸ συμβόλων on terms of equitable reciprocity, more or less, and in the courts of the defendant's city.

(2) Suits arising *ex delictis* between Athenians and allies, were decided in Athenian courts.

(3) Suits arising *ex delictis* between citizens of an allied state were at first tried in the local courts, with the provision that there should be an appeal to Athens in case the sentence were death, exile, or ἀτιμία. Later, however, the more important of such cases were brought to Athens at once, and only the trivial matters decided in the local courts.

(4) Ordinary civil cases arising between citizens of an allied city were always decided at home.

We may recur now to our passage of Thucydides. Stahl, who, in his edition printed *ξυμβολαίαις*, now proposes to follow Cobet, N. L. p. 432, in reading *ξυμβολιμαίαις*, since Hesych. has the gloss *ξυμβολιμαίαις δίκας* · Ἀττικοὶ τὰς κατὰ σύμβολα. His interpretation coincides in the main with that of Classen, with whom he agrees, particularly in separating *αὐτοῖς* from *ἡμῖν*. He takes the first *καί* as aiding the concessive force of the two participles which are connected by the second *καί*. He points out also that *παρ' ἡμῖν* in the second clause can have its proper meaning only if the cases spoken of in the first are *δίκαι ἀπὸ ξυμβόλων*, which we have seen would be tried in the courts of the defendant's city and not necessarily at Athens. The words may then be thus paraphrased: "for even though we exact less than our power would justify in cases decided under commercial treaties made with our allies, and though we have established for them trials in our own courts on the basis of impartial laws for us and them, we are thought to be litigious." In the latter clause the circumstances of the subject and tributary allies are evidently thought of; and in the former there is no reason why they should not be equally in view. For even if it be assumed that the Athenians would not negotiate a commercial treaty with a city already reduced to complete subordination, there is no reason to suppose that such treaties already existing would be abrogated when a state originally autonomous passed into the tributary condition, particularly if this came about, as it must in many, perhaps most cases, in the gradual and almost unconscious way described by Thuc. I 99, 3 and Plutarch Cim. 11. For we have seen that when Selymbria was restored to the alliance after revolt, its old *ξύμβολα* continued in force.

The way in which the jurisdiction of the Athenians was developed is well explained by Grote (VI^a p. 61). It was, he says, an indispensable element of the Delian confederacy that the members should forego their right of private war and submit their differences to peaceable arbitration; and the synod of Delos was the natural court of appeal in all such questions. From the beginning the Athenians had been the guiding and enforcing presidents of the synod; and when it gradually died away, as it must have done as more and more of the contracting states subsided into the condition of tribute-paying allies, the Athenians were found occupying its place and fulfilling its functions. He argues, also, that these functions must have been productive of more good than evil to the subject allies themselves. In case one of the weaker states had a complaint against a larger

one, there was no channel, except the synod of Delos or the Athenian tribunal, through which it could have any reasonable assurance of fair trial and justice. When some of the states had passed into the tributary condition while others continued to act as independent members of the synod, no doubt Athens would act as the patron of a complaining tributary state and present its claims before the synod; while disputes arising between two tributary states would probably be decided by the Athenians themselves without reference to the general assembly. And the conclusions to which Grote comes as to the suits which would naturally come to be decided by Athenian tribunals agree very nearly with what we have been able to deduce from the Inscriptions. "It is not to be supposed," he says, "that all the private complaints and suits between citizen and citizen, in each respective subject town, were carried up for trial to Athens, yet we do not know distinctly how the line was drawn between matters carried up thither and matters tried at home. The subject cities appear to have been interdicted from the power of capital punishment, which could only be inflicted after previous trial and condemnation at Athens; so that the latter reserved to herself the cognizance of most of the grave crimes—or what may be called 'the higher justice' generally. And the political accusations preferred by citizen against citizen in any subject city, for alleged treason, corruption, non-fulfilment of public duty, etc., were, doubtless, carried to Athens for trial—perhaps the most important part of her jurisdiction."

C. D. MORRIS.

III.—VOWEL-LENGTH IN KING ALFRED'S OROSIUS.

Investigations into the quantity of Old English vowels upon the basis of manuscript indications, have already been undertaken by Sweet¹ and by Sievers.² A complete exhibit of the long vowels of the individual texts, as determined by the accentuation and duplication of vowels, has as yet nowhere been given. The object of the present paper is to furnish such a list of long vowels, as contained in Part I of King Alfred's Orosius.

The vowels of the Old English words are conveniently divided into two groups, according as they are long by nature or by position. To the former of these groups (I) belong those vowels whose length can be determined by evidence independent of accentuation and duplication. The latter (II) comprises such vowels as have undergone secondary lengthening in certain positions, as before a liquid or nasal + consonant, when final, etc. These groups are followed by a third (III), which contains the proper nouns, mostly of foreign origin.

Since duplication occurs in only two instances, *waa* 114³¹ and *undablinnendlice* 36³¹, the evidence of length reposes, with these exceptions, entirely upon accentuation. Within each of the first two divisions the words are arranged in the order of the parts of speech, pronouns following immediately after nouns, and the prefixes being placed at the end. Inflected words are not reduced to their typical forms, as nouns to the nominative singular, verbs to the infinitive, etc., but are quoted as they occur in the text; the list is believed to be complete, or approximately so, the marginal forms from the Cottonian MS (C) being likewise included.

A few particulars may be noted:

(a) Diphthongs (if Sweet's edition accurately represents the MSS in this particular) usually take the accent on the former of the two vowels; thus *ea* (18 times), *gear* (3 times), *te* (12 times), *leaspellengum* (once, C), *triwpa* (once), *þeowan* (once), but *edc* (4

¹ Proceedings of the Philological Society for April 16, 1880, and June 3, 1881.

² Angelsächsische Grammatik, §§120-125.

times), *pedra* (once), while *on bedd* (once) may be considered doubtful.

(b) When *g* is lost before *d*, *ð* and *n*, the preceding palatal is lengthened (Sievers, *Angels. Gram.* §214, 3); examples are *rén* (twice), *beléd* (once), *līð* (once), *gesæd* (twice).

(c) The vowel of *dóm* is long, even when the independent word becomes a quasi-derivational suffix, as in *cristendóm*, *ealdor-dóm*, etc.

(d) The form *æmód* of Bosworth-Toller is to be corrected by 104⁴, and the prefix *a-* of the same dictionary is to be marked long, the 89 instances in Orosius, including *undablinnendlice*, being superadded to the arguments supplied by etymology.

(e) A number of examples of secondary lengthening are of interest. *Gód* 102¹⁸ reopens the question of a popular etymology of the word in the O. E. period (cf. Müller's *Science of Language*, Second Series, p. 302 of the American edition, and Skeat's *Ety-mol. Dict.* s. v. *God*).

Sēglode 19²⁵ may possibly indicate palatal or even vocalic pronunciation of the *g*.

Wrēcende 50²¹ (C) is supported by Orm's *wrekenn*; Strattmann has *wrēken*, Laz. 13749, but is not supported by Madden's edition; Chaucer (*Canterbury Tales* and *Romaunt of the Rose*) rimes *wreke* only with *speke* (once *awrekeith* with *brekeith*, Rom. Rose 278); moreover, these words are carefully distinguished, in Chaucer's rime-system, from words like inf. *seke*, O. E. *sēcan*, which rimes with *cheke*, *eke*, *meke*, *seeke* (O. E. *sēoc*), i. e. with words whose vowel is derived from an originally long vowel or diphthong of O. E. Hence, if the conclusions of Sweet (*Hist. Eng. Sounds*, pp. 51, 54, 111, 117), and of Ten Brink (*Anglia* I 530, 533), are to be accepted, we must assume that the *ē* of *wrēcende* is not only long (cf. Sievers, *Angelsächs. Gram.* §122), but has also undergone a change of quality, its pronunciation having become that of the low-front-narrow vowel. Accordingly, this secondarily lengthened *ē* (Sievers' *ē*) of O. E. is to be distinguished in sound from the older *ē* (*Hist. Eng. Sounds*, p. 33).

The forms *áfýlde* 258⁷ (C), *onstæled* 100¹¹ (C), *getrýmedon* 38³⁰ and *genéfa* 266⁸ (C) are unusual and remarkable. So, too, are the prefixes in *fórdón* 118²⁰, *gédýdon* 142⁸ and *wánspeða* 116³⁴.

Examples of misplaced accent, due to carelessness in transcription, are probably *apðs* 122¹⁹, *wærán* 70¹¹, the second syllable of *hír(r)án* 70¹, and perhaps *gédýdon* cited above.

I.—ORIGINAL LENGTH.

Nouns.

áde 20³⁷. ár (honor) 18¹⁵; áre 56², 94⁵. áre (brass) 54²⁴. árge-
otere 2⁶ (doubtful accent), 54³⁰. æ 88¹⁹, 106³⁴, 250¹⁹. ærendracan
92⁶, 136⁶, 142¹. æwielme 14³⁶.

bán 17³⁶. blód 30⁹. bóc 58¹², 266²². bót 64¹⁸.

cóortana (C) 242².

dædbote 256¹³. dæll 20³⁰, 46¹⁸, 48⁶, 52²⁷, 88³, 110¹³, 150¹; dæll
46²⁰. díc 74¹⁸. dóm 96³⁴; cristendóm 48²⁶, 212²¹, 258³¹, 260²¹, 286³,
288⁶, 288⁸; ealdordóm 88³⁰; freodóm 202²⁰; ðeowdóm 98³, þeow-
dóme 224³⁰.

éa 8¹⁶, 8³⁰, 10¹⁶, 10³⁷, 10³⁰, 12¹⁹, 14¹⁴, 22¹, 22⁵, 22³⁹, 26¹⁸, 26³¹, 72¹²,
74¹, 74², 76⁶, 84⁵, 124²⁹.

flán 112¹⁵, 144²⁷. fýr 1⁶, 5²⁴, 88³⁰, 168³⁵, 180¹⁷, 220¹⁵, 226¹, 252²²,
286³¹; fýrbryne 252²⁰; fýrsmortendum 36³⁰.

gerád 122⁴, 236⁵. genót 212¹⁵. géar 20²³, 142²³; géare 108¹⁸;
gér 270²², 274³.

hám 17²⁴. hæþena 32³⁸. hús 274¹²; maðmhús 240¹⁵.

ie 8¹⁰, 8¹¹, 8¹⁴, 10⁷, 10¹³, 10³⁰, 10³⁶, 14²⁸, 16², 186²³, 186²⁷, 186³¹.

líf 112¹². léaspellengum 94²⁹ (C).

mándæda 42¹⁷ (cf. Mánfeld 108²⁰). mæd 92¹⁵. médo 20¹⁹.
mór 18³².

pínunge 54²².

rædþeahteras 72², 256²; unræd 170¹³. rén 194¹⁹, 194²⁶.

sæ 1¹⁷, 3²², 8²⁰, 10¹⁶, 10³¹, 10³⁴, 12¹²⁽²⁾, 12²⁴, 12²⁵, 12²⁸, 12³⁰, 14¹⁶,
17⁶, 17¹⁴, 17¹⁸, 18²⁶, 19¹⁸, 19³⁰, 20¹³, 22³, 22⁶, 26²³, 28¹¹, 30¹, 82¹²,
84¹³, 90²⁰, 96³¹, 104²⁸, 116⁵, 202¹, 206¹, 210²⁹, 226⁵, 226¹¹, 226¹², 246³⁰,
258¹⁶, 270¹⁴⁽²⁾; sæs 10³⁴, 12²⁰, 16²⁴, 24¹⁴, 210²¹; sæearm 22⁴; sæfæ-
relde 38³²; Ostsæ 16²⁴; Profentsæ 22³⁰; Wendelsæ 8²⁹, 8²⁶, 8²⁷, 12¹,
12¹⁴, 12²³, 14²¹, 14³³, 22¹⁴, 22¹⁸, 22²⁹, 24⁶, 24¹¹, 26¹, 26⁷, 26¹⁴, 26¹⁷;
Wendelsæs 8¹²; Westsæ 17³; widsæ 17²⁷, 19²⁶. scír 19⁹. scóp
202²⁶. súþ 106¹².

tácne 38²⁶. tríewþa 218¹⁷. túne 264⁴.

ungetíma 70⁷ (C).

þeátra 154³. þéowan 20¹⁷.

wáa 114³¹. wíf 1²⁶, 44³⁰, 44³⁰, 64³⁴, 266¹⁴; wífmen 48¹³. wól 70¹²;
wólþærnes 62²⁴; wólþryne 86²⁴.

yǵland 26²⁸. ýst 104²².

Pronouns.

- (1) Personal: hí 34¹, 258¹⁵, 258³⁰ (C), 268⁴ (C), 276¹⁶ (C);
 hý (only in C) 48¹³, 146²⁸, 170⁴, 172¹⁵, 172³¹, 202¹¹. ús 20⁴, 24⁷.
 (2) Demonstrative: ðás 62¹¹; þás 136³⁰.
 (3) Indefinite: nán 17²⁴, 210²¹.

Adjectives.

- (1) Descriptive: áemode 104⁴.
 brád 20⁸, 226¹.
 genóg 260¹¹; genóh 20¹⁰, 58¹⁴. gód 18³, 36¹, 58¹⁶, 98³, 250¹⁷;
 góde 62⁵, 264³, 270³⁰; gódes 264³. gódcunde 32²⁷.
 hír(r)án 70¹.
 rícestena 258¹⁴.
 wís 58¹².
 (2) Numeral: án 3⁶, 3³³, 12³², 19¹⁰, 21¹², 21¹³, 26³⁴, 40⁴, 48³³, 70³⁴,
 80²⁹, 90⁶, 90²⁰, 102⁷, 104²², 108¹⁰, 112²⁷, 116¹, 116⁴, 118³, 120³¹, 140¹⁴,
 152²⁹, 154²⁸, 216⁶, 216³¹, 226¹⁰, 234³, 244²⁶, 244³⁰ (C), 282¹⁹; áne
 202³; ánes 160³⁰; áne 40¹³; ánum 240³⁰; ánrædnesse 222¹⁷.
 tú 76²⁵. þrý 150¹¹ (C); þrím 34³⁰. fíf 20³⁸.

Verbs.

- (ge-, on) bád 17¹⁵, 102³⁰, 140³⁰. bæd 108¹⁰, 146¹⁹. (ge) búd 17²⁸;
 (ge) bún 60³⁴. (on) beád 168¹³ (C).
 (be-, ofer) cóm 5²⁷, 64¹⁸, 86²⁵, 92¹³, 108¹¹, 134²⁶, 136¹¹, 140²³,
 158²², 158³¹, 166¹⁸, 166²², 168¹⁶, 178², 178²², 180¹⁷, 190⁶, 196²⁵, 200³,
 200³², 204³⁴, 206³, 210¹, 212³, 216¹⁷, 222¹³, 222²², 228³, 228¹⁶, 230⁰,
 234²⁴, 236⁸, 242¹⁷, 244⁹, 252³⁰, 252²⁹, 254¹³, 258³¹, 260¹⁰, 268⁸, 268¹²,
 274²¹, 278²³, 280¹¹, 286²¹.
 (a-, for-, ge) dón 1¹⁹, 54³⁰, 78⁴, 102¹³, 118¹⁶, 156⁷, 246³⁴, 256¹³,
 258¹⁹, 260¹, 286¹²; (a) dó 104³⁸; déð 230²⁷; (for-, ge) dón (pp.) 34¹⁹,
 36²⁴, 54²⁸, 92³⁶, 118³⁶, 118²⁷, 130³⁹, 132⁹, 134³². (for) dráf 72³⁰.
 (a) fédde 152²⁹. (an-, ofer-, on) fón 126¹⁸, 164⁸ (C), 164²², 164³²
 (C), 218³⁴, 282⁹. (a-, ge) fór 4⁷, 4¹³, 4³⁰, 5²¹, 17²⁴, 30³, 30³⁰, 50²⁴,
 52²⁷, 74³, 76⁵, 76¹³, 80²⁴, 80³⁹, 84³, 84¹⁸, 90¹⁵, 98⁴, 114³, 114⁷, 114¹²,
 116¹⁷, 116¹⁸, 116³⁴, 118²¹, 124²⁶, 126¹¹, 126¹³, 130⁶, 132⁴, 132²⁷, 134¹,
 134⁴, 134¹⁰, 138²⁹, 150¹⁸, 158³⁰, 168²⁶, 168²⁷, 194³, 198³³, 202²⁴, 204³,
 204³⁵, 206¹¹, 208²⁷, 210²⁴, 218⁸, 218¹², 220⁴, 220⁵, 224¹⁸, 226²², 228⁹,
 230⁴, 232⁶, 238¹⁸, 240¹, 240¹⁵, 240¹⁸, 240³⁰, 240³², 240³⁷, 240³⁹, 242³⁹,
 260⁹, 262²⁸, 268²⁴, 270¹¹, 270¹⁴, 272³, 272¹⁵, 274²², 276¹⁷, 276³¹, 276²²,

280¹⁴, 282¹, 282²¹, 282²⁷, 284²⁸, 286¹⁴, 288²⁷, 284²³ (C), 284²³, 286¹⁴, 288²⁷; gefóre 19²².

(ge-, ut) gán 120²¹, 124¹⁵, 134¹⁸, 212⁵. gewát 78¹⁸.

hæt 12¹; hét 1²⁷. (be-, to) hlád 102²⁰, 102²².

(ge) íecte 216¹⁶.

(be) léd 122²⁰. (for) lét 258¹⁸, 258¹⁹, 272³, 280²⁰. líð 20²².

(ge) sæd 88²⁸, 102²⁴. (a) scóp 40²³. (ut) scýt 8²¹, 12²⁰, 14¹⁴, 22³, 22²⁹. (for) slóg 124³, 200²¹, 214¹². (wið) sóc 78⁵. (a-, ge) spón 30²⁰, 66¹¹, 68¹², 146⁷, 204²⁰, 218¹⁰. (ge) stód 252⁵. (be) swác 66¹⁰, 210¹⁰. swór 190²². sýn (subj. 3 pl. pres.) 30⁴.

(geor) trúwige 86⁴ (C).

(be) þóhtan 174²⁰ (C).

wát (know) 242²². wrát 234⁵.

Adverbs.

á (ever) 17²⁷, 212¹⁷, 228²², 230¹, 270². ær 48²⁴, 54¹⁴, 56²⁵, 58⁷, 80²⁰, 84³, 94¹⁰, 98², 98¹⁸, 98²⁷, 98²⁹, 116²², 118²⁸, 122²³, 136²¹, 144¹⁸, 146²², 146²⁰ (C), 156²⁸, 162¹⁹, 192¹⁵, 212¹⁴, 224⁴, 238¹¹.

eác 34¹, 36¹⁸, 42¹⁵, 42¹⁶.

hú 34¹⁰. hwón 48¹⁹.

má 80²³, 136²². mæst 260²².

ná 200²⁰.

swá 98¹⁸ (C). swíþor 216¹⁶.

þá 30²³, 86¹¹ (C), 152¹⁵ (C). þær 130⁶ (C).

út 8²⁰, 20⁷, 20¹⁰, 21⁷, 34¹⁶, 72¹³, 92²⁸, 92³⁰, 96³, 118²³, 168⁴, 178²¹, 206¹⁸, 258³, 258¹⁶, 276¹⁴; úte 98²; út sihte 262²⁸.

Prepositions.

tó 222¹⁴, 242²⁷; tó forætan 34²⁶; tó geheton 234²⁴.

Prefixes.

ábædon 268¹⁸. (un) áablinnendlice 36²¹. ábreca 206¹⁸; ábræc 124⁵; ábræcon 170²³; ábrocen 3²³. ábrodne 134¹⁴. áceorfan 76²¹; ácorfen 172⁴. ácwælan 92²⁸, 250⁴; ácwealde 112¹⁶, 206²⁸; ácwealdon 260²⁸. ácwencean 200¹⁷. ádræfde 126¹⁶, 126¹⁹, 126²¹; ádræfed 150²³. ádruncne 226¹¹. ádyde 204⁹ (C). áeargoden 212²⁰. áflymede 238²¹ (C); áfliemed 1²⁶. áfor 124²³, 186²⁹, 246²⁴; áfór 124²⁶. áfuhten 230²¹. áfýlde 258⁷ (C); áfýlled 188²⁷. ágæled 134²⁰. ágeafan 224¹⁴. ágoldene 250²¹. áhof 78²¹; áhofan 112²²;

upáhofon 222¹⁹; áhæfen 278²², 284³⁰. áhon 164²²; áheng 222²⁰; áhengon 276¹⁸. áhleop 130²⁹; áhleopon 244¹⁷. áliefan 238⁷; áliefed 202²⁰. álibban 108¹⁷. áloccoden 206¹⁸, 222³. ámeldad 166²⁹. ámirre 212²⁷; ámirdon 162²⁰. áraeran 232¹⁷; áraernesne (sb.) 98⁹. áreccean 86¹⁸. áriman 50¹⁸; únárimede 102²²; unárimedlice 88¹². ásæde 100²⁰. áscop 72¹⁴. ásende 44⁷. áslawoden 212¹⁹. ásmorodon 224²⁴. áspón 240¹¹; áspón 66¹¹, 204³⁰. ástige 142²⁰. (up) áteon 202²³; átugan 226¹⁸. ápeostrade 256¹⁰. áwende 78⁸, 250³⁰. áweorpan 198³⁰. áwerede 134²⁶; áweredon 210²³. áweste 62²; áwestan 56¹², 142¹⁰; áweston 204¹², 204²². áwritene 258¹⁴.

II.—SECONDARY LENGTHENING.

Nouns.

gód 102¹⁸.
hánd 134¹⁸.
món 136⁹.
(ge) néfa 266⁶ (C).
scíprapas 18²¹; scíprapum 18³.
wég 172²² (C). wínd 226¹⁰.

Pronouns.

hé 36¹, 130⁶ (C); hís 130⁶ (C); him 150²⁷.

Adjectives.

Lángbeardas 192⁹ (C).

Verbs.

(ge) ærneð 21⁴.
(a) brác 74²⁹, 104²⁹.
(á) fylde 258⁷ (C).
(on) hángen 256¹⁸ (C).
(be-, ge) sæt 116⁹, 118⁴, 270⁷, 280²⁹. séglode 19²⁵. (on) stæled 100¹¹ (C).
(ge) trýmedon 38³⁰.
wrécende 50²¹ (C); wrác 262³.

Adverbs.

nú 64¹⁸, 182²² (C), 238³ (C).
úp 5²², 22⁴, 220¹², 226¹, 226¹², 226¹⁹; úpahofon 122²⁴.

Prepositions.

óf 42¹⁵, 42¹⁶, 42¹⁸, 216²⁴. ón 38³³, 40¹⁸, 42¹⁴, 220¹⁰.

Prefixes.

ándrysne 244⁸.

fórdón 118²⁶.

gédýdon 142⁸.

ónfon 268²¹.

únárimede 102²²; únarimedlice 224²⁰; únarimedlican 82¹⁹; (ge) únaredon 34³⁸; únasecgendlicre 60¹; úneape 84¹⁰; úngearwe 98¹⁸; úngemetlic 126⁹; úngemet(t)lice 48¹⁷, 96³², 124²⁰; úngemetlican 80²⁸; úngemetlicre 30²⁸; úngeþwærnes 82³⁰; únmltsunge 64¹⁶; únoferwunnen 156²⁸; únspedigan 20¹⁷; únspedgestan 30⁴; ún-tweogend 134²⁷; únweorþ 84²³.

wánspeda 116²⁴.

III.—PROPER NOUNS.

Ahténe 96²⁴ (C). Ámintas 130²¹. Archaláus 238¹ (C). Áris-tonocuse 224⁷.

Blecingaég 20³. Bosíriðis 40²².

Catóne 242³⁰ (C).

Heliúses 176³² (C).

Iustínus 32²⁰.

Læland 19³⁵. Lángbeardas 192⁹ (C). Leuínus 196³².

Macedónie 100¹³ (C). Mánfeld 108²⁰. Minothéo 130¹⁰.

Numántiam 220¹⁹ (C).

Orósíus.

Paflógoniam 224⁹. Parapemenás 144⁵ (C). Pharaón 34²⁷. Pholoméus 142²⁶ (C). Phtoloméus 146⁴ (C).

Rín 22²⁸. Rómware 48¹⁷.

Sarþanápólus 50²⁰; Sarðanopolím 42⁵. Sarðíniam 172¹⁴ (C). Scípíó 222¹³ (C); Scípian 222²⁰ (C). Scóneg 19³⁵. Sómpeius (error for Pómpeius) 32²⁰, 34⁴.

ALBERT S. COOK.

IV.—LUCAN AS HISTORICAL SOURCE FOR APPIAN.

It does not increase our confidence in the conclusions of the recent "Quellenforschung" among the Germans to find each of no less than five authors claimed as the main or even the sole source of Dio Cassius in his history of the second Punic war.¹ So the attempt to limit Appian in an extensive portion of his Civil Wars exclusively to Asinius Pollio² is an unsuccessful one. Appian probably added to his main excerpt less material drawn from various sources than Plutarch did. He had no such keen literary appetite as Plutarch had. But even admitting the lowest estimate of his historical method, and ranking him as a "blundering compiler," it can be shown that he was not wholly tied down even to so excellent an authority as Pollio. We may, perhaps, wish that he had been. His history would have been more valuable to us.

A very trustworthy estimate of Appian's method is given by Hannak, *Appianus und seine Quellen* (Wien, 1869), p. 40. He concludes "dass Appianus eigentlich schon Vorhandenes überarbeitete, dass er jederzeit eine Hauptquelle vor sich hatte, die er höchstens durch einzelne anderswoher entlehnte Daten ergänzte . . . Zugleich macht sich nicht selten eine Flüchtigkeit geltend, die nicht tiefer in die Sache eindringt, sondern mit grosser Willkür Thatsachen und Begebenheiten nach eigenem Ermessen sich zurecht legt. Nur in den rhetorischen Partien ist er zuweilen selbstständig." Just these features of Appian's method are well illustrated by what I am confident was his improvement of an item in Lucan's poetical account of the battle of Palaepharsalus.

That Appian was acquainted with Lucan's *Pharsalia* is very probable on general grounds. The poem was famous, Appian was long a resident and magistrate at Rome,³ and his contemporary, the rhetorical compiler Florus, has been shown⁴ to be deeply indebted to Lucan as well as to Livy. The extent of Appian's

¹ H. Haupt, in *Philol.* 40, p. 140.

² P. Baillet, *Quomodo Appianus in bell. civ. lib. ii-v, usus sit Asinii Polionis historiis* (Gött. Diss. 1874), p. 25.

³ Hannak, *ibid.*, pp. 4-8.

⁴ Westerborg, *Rhein. Mus.* 37, pp. 35-49

indebtedness to Lucan I reserve for fuller discussion elsewhere, and confine myself now to a consideration of the incident given by him and by him alone of the historians, in Bell. Civ. II 75: οἱ δ' ἐξιώντες (Caesar's forces from their camp) τὸ τεῖχος ἤρπειπον μετὰ σιωπῆς βαθυτάτης, καὶ ἐς τὴν τάφρον αὐτὸ ἐνεχώνησαν.

Of this Caesar says not a word, nor can any possible strategic motive be adduced which could have justified such a foolhardy departure from good Roman tactics and Caesar's universal practice. The explanation which Dean Merivale gives of it, that in Caesar's eagerness to accept the proffered challenge he "ordered the works of his camp to be levelled for his battalions to deploy in line without obstruction and take up their ground instantaneously" (Hist. of the Romans, II, p. 232), will not bear inspection. It was Pompey who had at last after many days (continentibus diebus, Caes. B. C. III 84, 2) reluctantly accepted Caesar's repeated challenges, and even then he did not advance toward Caesar's camp, but simply into the plain below his own (c. 85, 3), where he awaited Caesar's approach. There was nothing for Caesar to gain by breaking a passage out of his camp, and he was not so eager to fight his greatest battle, against double odds, as to neglect the ordinary routine precautions. Besides, if a word more can be necessary, it would have taken more time to demolish the walls of a Roman camp than for its occupants to march out of the ordinary gates and form in order of battle outside.

The only other modern historian known to me who accepts this incident from Appian, is Drumann, Geschichte Roms, III, p. 509: "der Soldat," he says, in accounting for the command of Caesar to demolish the walls of the camp, "sollte seine eigene Schutzwehr sein." That is very poetical and romantic, but the great disasters at Dyrrhachium were not so far behind that Caesar could venture to call upon his veterans to fight in an unsoldierly way. They might so far have recovered their old eagerness to meet the enemy as to refuse to wait for reenforcements (Plut. Caes. 43), but they must have met the enemy in the way to which they had been trained.

Both Merivale and Drumann, while accepting this incident from Appian, fail to say anything about a sentence of Caesar's which almost directly denies it. In giving the number of his troops Caesar says (c. 89, 2): cohortes VII¹ castris praesidio reliquerat.

¹ Probably the correct reading for the II of the MSS. See Heller, Philol. 19, p. 527, and the note *ad loc.* in the Kraner-Hofmann edition.

Surely, to dismantle a safely fortified camp, either in order to stimulate soldiers to fight with the courage of despair, or in order to rush them out in full battle array against an enemy quietly waiting miles away, and then to garrison that camp with seven much needed cohorts, is too absurd generalship to be laid at the door of Caesar.¹ Even Froude resists the rhetorical and poetical seduction of this incident.

Much of that which Appian alone hands down to us is felt to be totally untrustworthy, but in few cases can we prove the historian's worthlessness so clearly as in that of the incident under comment. Just before the fatal onset at Palaepharsalus, Lucan, in the pseudo-Homeric manner, puts a speech of 78 hexameters into the mouth of Caesar, and one of 40 into that of Pompey. Both speeches are artificial and rhetorical to the last degree. At the very climax of Caesar's speech, and after an appeal to his soldiers to trample on all ties of kin in the coming carnage, stands this passage (Phars. VII 326-333):

- "Sternite iam vallum, fossasque implete ruina,
Exeat ut plenae acies non sparsa manipulis.
Parcite ne castris; vallo tendetis in illo,
Unde acies peritura venit." Vix cuncta locuto
- (330) Caesare, quemque suum munus trahit, armaque raptim
Sumpta, Ceresque viris; capiunt praesagia belli;
Calcatisque ruunt castris; stant ordine nullo,
Arte ducis nulla; permittunt omnia fati.

The whole speech of Caesar, ending in v. 329, is highly colored rhetorical poetry, and the commands *Et primo ferri motu prosternite mundum* (v. 278), *vultus gladio turbate verendos* (v. 322), are no less unhistorical than the *Sternite iam vallum*. The actual speech we have from the very best authority, the one who made it, in *Caes. B. C. III* 85, 4: *Tunc Caesar apud suos, cum iam esset agmen in portis, "Differendum est," inquit, "iter in praesentia nobis, et de proelio cogitandum, sicut semper depoposcimus. Animo simus ad dimicandum parati; non facile occasionem postea reperiemus."* Nor is the contrast between the calm and simple speech which Caesar actually made and the swollen bombast which Lucan puts into his mouth any greater than that between the poet's description of what followed the speech (vv. 329-333) and

¹ Caesar uses both camps after the battle as if both were alike fortified (c. 97, 3).

the soldier's. The poet has the army hurriedly take arms, food, and omens, tear down the walls of the camp and rush forth in no order and leaving everything to the fates.¹ The soldier simply says: *confestimque expeditas copias educit* (c. 85, *fin.*) Who now can hold that among all the evident rhetorical embellishments of the poet, that of the demolition of the walls of the camp alone is based on fact?

Appian evidently thought so. He too, as rhetorical ornaments for his narrative, puts speeches into the mouths of Caesar and Pompey, just before the battle. These have more than one point of resemblance to the corresponding speeches in Lucan, but one which is very striking. At the close of Caesar's speech in Appian (B. C. II 74, *fin.*) is this passage: *πρὸ δὲ πάντων, ὥς ἂν εἰδείην ὑμᾶς ἔγωγε ὧν συνετίθεσθε μεμνημένους τε καὶ νίκην πάντως ἢ θάνατον αἰρουμένους, καθέλτε μοι προΐοντες ἐπὶ τὴν μάχην τὰ τεῖχη τὰ σφέτερά αὐτῶν καὶ τὴν τάφρον ἐγχώσατε, ἵνα μηδὲν ἔχωμεν ἂν μὴ κρατῶμεν, ἴδωσι δ' ἡμᾶς ἀσταθμεύτους οἱ πολέμιοι, καὶ συνῶσιν ὅτι πρὸς ἀνάγκης ἐστὶν ἡμῖν ἐν τοῖς ἐκείνων σταθμεύσαι.* This is plainly nothing more than the poet Lucan's rhetorical climax for his speech of Caesar, somewhat reduced to terms of prose. One reason for the command, *ὥς ἂν εἰδείην . . . αἰρουμένους*, is Appian's substitution for the *Exeat ut plenis . . . manipulis* of Lucan. The other, *ἵνα μηδὲν ἔχωμεν . . . σταθμεύσαι*, is Appian's prose for Lucan's

"vallo tendetis in illo,

Unde acies peritura venit."

The first reason is the one adopted by Drumann (see above p. 326). The reason which Merivale adopts (see p. 326) is that one of Lucan for which Appian substituted one of his own.

Neither Lucan nor Drumann nor Merivale trouble themselves with the perfectly trustworthy statements of Caesar (see pp. 326 f.) that he left a large force to guard his camp, and occupied it again after the battle. For Lucan this is no fault. The poet is not expected either to write history or to make rhetorical embellishments correspond to facts. For Drumann and Merivale it is an inconsistency. Even Appian is more critical in this matter than either of them. Having borrowed Lucan's rhetorical ornament for Caesar's speech, he must, as a would-be historian, make his narrative of subsequent events accord with the speech, and so far as possible with the account of Caesar-Pollio. He therefore says

¹ Contrast Plut. Pomp. 68, *fin.*

at the close of Caesar's speech (II 75, *inil.*): ὁ μὲν τοσάδε εἰπὼν φυλακὴν ὁμῶς τῶν σκηνῶν κατέπεμπε δισχιλίους τοὺς πάνυ γέροντας. The ὁμῶς recognizes the inconsistency of tearing down the fortifications of the camp and then putting a garrison in it, and the τοὺς πάνυ γέροντας is the first feature in Appian's attempt to make good the inconsistency.

The garrison was composed, Appian means, of Caesar's oldest and weakest soldiers,¹ who could not do much service in the line of battle, and so were assigned the unimportant duty of guarding the defenceless camp. But surely these old soldiers, whose special abhorrence was the digging of entrenchments, would have been more serviceable to their general in a fortified camp. Appian's disposition of them would have left them at the mercy of the enemy in a way most unlike Caesar. This Appian's own military sense recognizes when he makes Pompey give orders to the hordes of barbarian allies which he could not employ in his regular line of battle κυκλοῦσθαι τοὺς πολεμίους καὶ διώκειν, ὅσα δύναντο βλάπτοντας, καὶ τὸ στρατόπεδον αὐτὸ Καίσαρος ἀχαράκωτον ὃν διαρπάζειν (c. 75, *fin.*) When, however, the Roman legions of Pompey were routed, these allies, according to Appian, κατεπλήσσαντο τὴν εὐταξίαν, καὶ οὔτε ἐς τὰς σκηνὰς τοῦ Καίσαρος ἐτόλμων ὑπὸ θαύματος, ὀλίγων αὐτὰς καὶ πρεσβυτέρων ἀνδρῶν φυλασσόντων, περιδραμεῖν, οὔτε τι ἄλλο ἢ ἐστῶτες ἐθάμβουν (c. 79, *fin.*) We surely are not at liberty to suppose that Caesar would have left such an attractive point of attack for Pompey's superfluous allies as seven cohorts of decrepit veterans in a dismantled camp, especially when there is nothing in Caesar's account of the battle to justify any such belief, but rather much to discredit it, and when the only authority for the absurdity is a rhetorical passage in a fictitious speech, attributed to Caesar by a sensational poet, and then misinterpreted and foolishly elaborated into an inconsistent and absurd narrative of facts by the blundering Appian.

The second feature of Appian's attempt to make good the inconsistency between Caesar's first dismantling his camp and then garrisoning it may be found in the following incident. When Pompey saw this dismantling of Caesar's camp, Appian says (II 75, *ad inil.*): ἡγουμένων τινῶν ἐς φυγὴν αὐτοὺς συσκευάζεσθαι, συνίει τοῦ τολμήματος, καὶ ἔστενε καθ' αὐτὸν ὅτι χωροῦσιν ἐς χεῖρας θηρίοις, λιμὸν ἔχοντες, ἄξιον θηρίων φάρμακον. Now it was before Dyrrhachium that Caesar's

¹ Cf. Plut. Pomp. 66; Caes. 40; App. Bell. Civ. II 66.

army suffered from hunger. Here they were driven to make a kind of bread from dried and pulverized roots, and loaves of this bread they threw into Pompey's intrenchments, to show how useless it was for their enemy to expect them to raise the siege for lack of supplies. Then it was that they were looked upon as wild beasts (Caes. B. C. III 48; Plut. Caes. 39). After his great defeat here, however, Caesar saw his error in trying to reduce an enemy so well provisioned as Pompey was, when he himself had such a meager commissariat. For this reason, among others, he transferred the struggle into the fertile plain of Thessaly, where his army had abundant supplies (cf. Caes. B. C. III 47; 74, 3; 81, 3; 84, 1). Whatever difficulties he labored under here, lack of supplies was not one of them. Nor does any other authority than Appian imply this, for the famous words of Caesar (Plut. Pomp. 68; cf. App. B. C. II 73, *ad init.*) that the day had come when they would fight with men, and not with hunger and want, refer plainly to the last time his army had fought and the disastrous defeats at Dyrrhachium, not to their present condition. So the "ut monendis castris pluribusque adeundis locis commodiore re frumentaria uteretur" of Caes. B. C. III 85, 2, implies no actual want, but simply the necessity of bringing up supplies, instead of marching where they were. Appian has very plainly jumbled his notes or recollections, as he so often does, and transferred an incident and a sentiment which are in place before Dyrrhachium, to Palaepharsalus. In this error Drumann (III, pp. 502 ff.) and Mommsen (IV, p. 496, Am. Ed.) have allowed themselves to follow him, so far, at least, as to magnify into pressing want what was simply a marked inferiority in Caesar's commissariat, as compared with Pompey's.

Nemo sane crediderit, Appianum, cui ad opus suum conscribendum tanti scriptores optimae notae praesto essent, ad Lucanum poetam recurrisset.¹ This judgment has been shown, I think, to need at least a slight modification.

B. PERRIN.

¹ Wijnne, *De fide et auctoritate Appiani*, &c. (Groningae, 1855), p. 52.

IV.—THE MEANING OF BAALIM AND ASHTAROTH IN THE OLD TESTAMENT.¹

The various phases of the worship of Baal and Ashtoreth among the Israelites and the relations of this worship to that of Jahve lie outside the limits of this article. Its object is to inquire into the meaning of the frequent use in the books of the Old Testament of the plural forms of these two divinities, Baalim and Ashtaroth. What this may be has been questioned by innumerable writers: the prevailing opinion is that these plural forms do not signify the divinities themselves, but only their representations or images. The principal advocate of this view is Gesenius, and after him has been generally adopted by critics. Even Schrader, in his *Keilinschriften u. das Alte Testament* (p. 180), notwithstanding the example of the Assyrian plural *Ishtarati*, "goddesses," holds to the same opinion. Some writers suggest the alternative also of holding Baalim to mean the different ways in which Baal was worshipped in various cities, but most agree in considering Ashtaroth to be merely representations. Perhaps a close examination of a number of passages in the O. T. itself may settle one side of the question at least, and prove that Gesenius' image theory is untenable.

Recent studies have shown that the worship of the Syro-Phoenician peoples was originally a worship of the active and passive forces of nature, and that these forces were personified in Baal and Astarte: this is not the place to discuss the various periods into which writers, like Müller, have divided the Baal-worship, nor to conjecture when the astrological element was introduced which identified Baal with the sun and Astarte with the moon and the planet Venus. Many, like Nöldeke,² Oort,³ Graf,⁴ etc., consider

¹ Consult: Münster, *Religion der Babylonier*. Movers, *Die Phönizien*. Gesenius, *Thesaurus*, *Komm. in Iesaia*, etc. Müller, articles *Baal* and *Astarte* in Herzog. Schrader, *Baal und Bel* in *Theol. Stud. u. Krit.* 1874. Baudissin, *Yahve et Moloch*, 1874, and articles on *Baal* and *Astarte* in Herzog and Plitt. Schlottmann, art. *Baal* in Riehm's *Handw.* II lief. 1875. Articles in McClintock and Strong's *Cyclopaedia*. Fürst, *Lexicon*, etc.

² ZDMG, XV 80q.

³ Dienst der Baal in Israel, 1864. See also the transl. w. additions by Bishop Colenso, 1865.

⁴ Comm. on *Isaia*.

Baal to be a common name for the divinity, as indicated by its meanings, "lord, master, husband." Others would not deny all personality, but would hold Baal to be the principal deity adored. This universal Baal, however, was subdivided, and his various forms and modifications separately worshipped. Many of these phases appear in the O. T., and others are found in Phoenician and Palmyrenian inscriptions; *e. g.* Baal-Shamen, Baal as King of Heaven; Baal-Berith, "Covenant-Baal"; Baal-Gad, "Fortune-giving Baal"; Baal-Zebub, etc. Each city, again, had its Baal or tutelary divinity: those mentioned in the O. T. are well known, as Baal-Hermon, Baal-Shalisha, Baal-Hazor, etc. Many others appear on inscriptions: for example, Baal of Tyre,¹ Baal of Sidon,² Baal of Libya,³ Baal of Gebal (Byblus),⁴ Baal of Lebanon,⁵ Baal of Tarsus,⁶ etc.

This much being prefixed, we will pass to the examination of Gesenius' image theory. To sustain this unusual theory, it would be necessary to have very positive proof; for were the evidence simply negative, the balance of probabilities would be in favor of the usual plural meaning.

Now an examination of the passages in the O. T. where the word *Baalim* occurs does not disclose a single one where it is absolutely necessary to hold to the image theory.

We will take up those which lend themselves most readily to this interpretation. The wording of Hosea XI 2, "*they sacrificed unto Baalim and burned incense to graven images*," must be read together with the other passages in Hosea, which are among the most damaging to the image theory: II 13, *I will visit upon her the days of Baalim*, *i. e.* the feast-days on which she worshipped them, and v. 17, "*for I will take away the names of Baalim out of her mouth*."⁷ The expression, *the names of Baalim*, cannot refer to images, but to Baalim as a general name for false gods, or as a comprehensive term for the different forms of Baal. Another passage (II Chron. XXIV 7) is also equivocally worded: *the dedicated things of the house of the Lord did they* (the sons of Athaliah) *bestow upon Baalim*. The last words of the text *'asû*

¹ Insc. in Corp. Insc. Sem. fasc. I.

² Insc. of King Esmunazar in Corp. Insc. Sem. fasc. I.

³ Baal hal-Lubbi (Numid. 4, 1).

⁴ Corpus Insc. Semit. fasc. I.

⁵ In Inscr. found *in situ*; see Corp. Insc. Sem. fasc. I, p. 25 and 26.

⁶ Baal Terez; on coins.

⁷ Cf. Wunsche, *Der Prophet Hosea*, 1868.

le-Baalim would be translated by the followers of the image theory, *made into Baalim*, i. e. images of Baal. A comparison with other passages in which the same words occur makes this an improbable translation: in II Kings XXIII 4, Josiah commands *to bring forth out of the temple of the Lord all the vessels that were made for Baal and Ashera*, etc., i. e. appointed for, consecrated to. Compare also II Chron. XXVIII 2: *Ahaz made also molten images for Baalim*. Of course the Gesenius theory involves translating Hosea II 10, '*asû le-Baal, made into a (representation of) Baal*, and we should reach the point of finding in the O. T. only references to Baal-images, even in the singular. But in this passage it is evident that the verb '*asa*' refers, not only to the gold and silver, but also to the *corn, wine and oil*,¹ and must therefore be taken in the meaning *to offer, consecrate*.

The many passages in which the children of Israel are reproached with doing evil in the sight of Jahve, and going after or walking after or serving Baalim, or Baalim and Ashtaroth, or Asheroth, may not seem at first decisively against the image theory. The whole group is, however, made quite clear by other passages which will now be quoted. Judges VIII 33 says: *The children of Israel went a-whoring after Baalim*, and then goes on to specify which Baal in particular they worshipped, saying: *and made Baal-Berith their god*. In the following chapter (IX 46) we find the mention of *beth El Berith*, "the temple of the god Berith"; this is a point in favor of Baal = god. The various references in the tenth chapter are of great importance. In the sixth verse we ought, in translating, to omit the *and* after Ashtaroth, and read: *And the children of Israel . . . served Baalim and Ashtaroth, the gods of Syria, and the gods of Zidon, and the gods of Moab, and the gods of the children of Ammon, and the gods of the Philistines*, etc.² In this verse we must understand that Baalim and Ashtaroth are general terms under which the false divinities of these different peoples are included. In many passages the same use of *wç*, "that is," is found. This is confirmed by the next verse, in which all these divinities are comprised in the term Baalim: verses 13 and 16 may also be compared where the terms

¹ Cf. Baudissin's art. on Baal in Herzog, and Wünsche, *op. cit.* p. 60-62.

² Oppert seems to have come to the same conclusion. In a note to the Insc. of Esmunazar (Rec. of the Past, IX 114) he says: "*All Phœnician gods were BAAL, and all goddesses Astarte* (compare Jud. X 6). *As there existed a Baal of Sidon, there was also an Astarte of Sidon, bearing the same name.*"

other gods and *strange gods* are used. In support of this I Sam. VII 3 might also be cited, where Samuel says: *put away the STRANGE GODS and Ashtaroth from among you*; the result is given in the next verse: *Then the children of Israel did put away BAALIM and Ashtaroth*.

If this view be entertained, then Baalim would include all the male divinities, and the sentence of Servius (ad Aeneid I 729) *Lingua Punica Bal deus dicitur* would be correct. The objection to this is that many other deities beside the various forms of Baal and Astarte were adored among the Phoenicians, Canaanites and Syrians.

Turning to Ashtaroth, we find fewer indications of a similar character, for the reason that, generally speaking, the female divinity was included or understood in the male, and the worship of the latter was necessarily accompanied by that of the former. Ashtaroth-Qarnaim (Gen. XIV 5), or simply Ashtaroth (I Chron. VI 71, Deut. I 4, and Joshua passim), occurs as the name of a city in Bashan. The Philistines seem to have worshipped Ashtaroth as the Goddess of war (=Ishtar of Arbela, I Sam. XXXI 10). The singular form was not used in the O. T. until the introduction by Solomon of the worship of the Sidonian Astarte: *Ashtoreth the divinity of the Sidonians* (I Kings XI 5 and 33), or *the abomination of the Sidonians* (II Kings XXIII 13), by a similar change as was often made in substituting *בִּשְׁתֵּת* *bosheth*, *shameful thing*, for Baal in proper names¹ and otherwise.² These three are the only places where the singular occurs. Owing to the difficulty of explaining the exclusive use of the plural (especially in Ashtaroth-Qarnaim and in Judges II 13), it has been supposed by some to be only a *pluralis eminentiae* (e. g. by Schlottmann in ZDMG, XXXIV 650). There is even less willingness among scholars than in the case of Baalim to admit the possibility that Ashtaroth could signify the various forms of Astarte or even "false goddesses" in general. Still there are many reasons for adopting this opinion. Without going further than the Phoenician inscriptions, many indications are found. In the inscription of Esmunazar, King of Sidon, the king speaks of the erection, by his mother and himself, of the temple of Astarte, whom he calls *Aštart šem Baal*. Schlottmann and Renan take *šem Baāl* to be an epithet of Astarte, "*nomen Baalis*," and Oppert understands this in the sense of specifying an Astarte corresponding to the Baal of Sidon, i. e. of the same name.

¹ E. g. Ishbosheth (II Sam. II 4), Mephibosheth (II Sam. IV 4, etc.)

² Jer. III 24, Hos. IX 10.

Of great importance is a well-known passage in the inscription of King Mesha (c. 880 B. C.) The national god of the Moabites was Chemosh, a form of Baal, and throughout the inscription he is repeatedly referred to. When Mesha takes the city of Nebo he kills the men, but *devotes the women and maidens to Ashtar Chemosh*. Now, the connection in which this deity is mentioned leaves no doubt that reference is made to the licentious worship of Astarte. But there is a difficulty in the form being masculine; this has caused two opinions to be held: the one that the Ashtar, here mentioned, is an androgenous divinity, the counterpart of Ashtoreth, and the corresponding Himyaritic divinity *Athtar* is adduced to confirm this: Prof. Schlottmann, Ginsburg, etc., are of this opinion. Others, like Clermont Ganneau, Ed. Meyer, etc., consider Athtar here to be a female emanation,¹ and that in the same way as we have the female goddess *Tanith Pen Baal*, "Tanith, the face or reflection of Baal," and the above-mentioned *Ashtar sem Baal*, we have here the Astarte of Chemosh. To these examples can be added that of עֲתָר עֵתָה, "The 'Attar of 'Ate." The Aramaean form was 'Attar, corresponding to the Canaanite 'Ashtor (= Ashtar), which usually became, with a secondary feminine ending, Ashtar = Ashtoreth. In Assyrian Ishtar was originally the common name for goddess: in early translations of Sumero-Akkadian hymns (e. g. Haupt, *Akk. Spr.* p. 26, 38) the singular form appears with this meaning. In a list of gods from Assur-bani-pal's library,² Ishtar occupies the first place in the female divinities, by the side of *Ilu*, the common name for God, like the Hebrew *El*.³ Later on this general application of the word seems to have been confined to the plural *Ishtarati*, which always remained the usual word for goddesses.⁴

Different attributes of Ishtar were then personified. Ishtar of Arbela was the goddess of war; Ishtar of Aššur, or, later, of Nineveh, "the queen of the universe." Ishtar of Erech, worshipped there as Beltis (the evening star), or rather Belit, is more nearly related to the original conception of the nature-goddess. She was called Um-Uruk, "the mother of Erech," the Omoroca of Damascus, synon. with Tiamat, the watery chaos, out of whom as the original matter Bel produced the universe. Ishtar of Agade (as

¹ Cf. Dillmann in the Berl. Monatsb. 1881, p. 605.

² See Schrader's article in *Studien u. Kritiken*, 1874, p. 337-339.

³ Cf. Delitzsch, A. L. S. p. 73.

⁴ I am indebted to Prof. Haupt for the opportunity of reading the proofs of Ed. Meyer's article on Astarte in the . . .

the morning star) was worshipped there as Anunit. As queen of the underworld Ishtar was replaced by Allat "*who was in the first instance merely an epithet of herself*."¹ Even classical writers were aware of the different phases of Ishtar-Astarte and compare her to Venus, Juno, Luna, etc.²

The word Ishtar is now recognized by some to be of Semitic formation:³ the infixed *tau* denotes the passive form. It could thus be derived from the same root as the active form Aššur. In this connection it is unavoidable to refer to *Ashera*, with its masculine and feminine plurals *asherim* and *asherôt*: but here all attempt at a solution must fail for the present. It is certain that in most cases an *Ashera* is the wooden image of a divinity (male or female?)—as also are the plural forms—and it is equally certain that *Ashera* is in certain cases the name of a female divinity, whose worship was more or less licentious and always connected with that of Baal. Some regard *Ashera* to be merely another name for Ashtoreth, and the *Asheroth* to be her images; but others—like Movers, Kuenen, etc.—deny this absolute identification, without being able to offer any satisfactory solution. Their identity, however, seems to be strongly supported by such texts as Judges II 3 and III 7, as well as from the LXX at II Chron. XV 16 and XXV 18, etc. *Ashera* might be merely the feminine form of Aššur (through the Phoenician *aser*) V, although such a form as Baudissin suggests was not, it would seem, known to the Assyrians themselves. It may be that traces of Aššur-worship exist in the O. T. in the use of the form *asherim*: these wooden images placed on the altars of Baal cannot be proved to represent a female divinity. Fürst calls them *male images of Baal*, and there are strong reasons for considering his surmise to be correct.

Aššur, the national god of the Assyrians, was almost identical in his attributes with Bel, and there is a confusion in their female counterparts, Ishtar and Belit. In Tiglathpileser's prism-inscrip-

¹ Sayce, Lectures on Babylonian Literature, 37.

² On the identification of Ishtar and Belit, the attributes of Ishtar, etc., consult Schrader, K. A. T. p. 176-180.

³ Haupt, ASKT p. 206, An meinem ZDMG, XXXIV 758, ausgesprochenen Ansicht, dass der name Ištar nicht akkadischen Ursprungs sei, halte ich fest. Fr. Hommel sieht in Aphrodite eine volksetymologische Umgestaltung des Semitischen عثر mit ف statt ث. Vgl. dazu Lagarde, Orientalia, Heft 2 (Göttingen, 1880), S. 45, sowie Götting. Nachr. 1881, S. 396-400.

tion,¹ Belit is called the wife of Aššur, whereas in later inscriptions (Assur-nazir-pal to Assur-bani-pal) she is the wife of Bel.

When Ishtar became a concrete goddess, as *the queen of the universe, the first-born of the gods* (the mother of all), it is natural that she should have been associated with Bel, "the father of the gods," and at this stage the Phoenicians, Syrians, and Canaanites remained. Only after the raising of Aššur to a position of prominence, by the Assyrian conquests, was Ishtar related to him. It is an interesting fact that the Akkadian for Bel, beside Moul-ge, was ELU(M):² can this have any connection with the Semitic root לך?

To recapitulate in a few words. If the opinion that the plural forms of Baal and Ashtoreth represent only images of these divinities be set aside, as in discord with the texts of the O. T. and all extra-biblical evidence, there would remain the two hypotheses already mentioned:

I. Baalim and Ashtaroth were used as common nouns to signify *gods* and *goddesses*, and, to the Yahvistic worshipper, the strange and false divinities of the surrounding Hamitic nations; or, also:

II. They may represent the many various aspects of Baal and Ashtoreth, whether proceeding from the individualization of certain of their attributes, or from the different centres of their worship. In support of the first opinion is, on the one hand, the certainty of the use among the surrounding nations of Baal as a general term for the deity (compare the Akkad. Elu(m)-Bel), and on the other the fact that Ishtar in Assyrian was the word for goddess. Passages have also been adduced from the O. T. where the Baalim include all the divinities of the nations bordering on the Israelites, being a term synonymous with *strange gods*. For the second theory can be adduced the many forms of Baal mentioned in the O. T. and in the inscriptions; and also the fact of the existence of many divinities which it does not seem possible to relate to Baal.

Still these two theories do not necessarily conflict, if we hold that, in the primitive worship of the Hamitic tribes of Phoenicia, Canaan and Philistia, Baal was the universal deity, and that many divinities, like Moloch, Malkam, Melqart, Chemosh, etc., are modifications of the same idea. Even if some deities of a different

¹ Lotz, Tiglathp. p. 36.

² II Rawlinson, 59, 5.

origin were introduced, the original universal meaning of Baal must have been too firmly engrafted to be superseded. It is quite possible that both uses of the word were continued side by side, as was the case in Assyrian with Ishtar. Whatever may be the conclusions on this question, in such a puzzling subject the best way to arrive at any result must be to work, according to the method of Dionysius the Areopagite, by aphaeresis ; and in this case it is a help to be able to set aside the image theory.

A. L. FROTHINGHAM, JR.

V.—FRIEDRICH RITSCHL.

As President of the Johns Hopkins Philological Association, I find it incumbent on me to open the work of each session by a discourse, for which I try to choose, as often as possible, some theme of general interest. Such a subject was offered last year (1883) by the life of my teacher, Friedrich Ritschl, as depicted in the vivid pages of his biographer Ribbeck; and the sketch here presented is little more than a rapid *résumé* of Ribbeck's work,¹ with a few personal, perhaps too personal, comments. My youthful imagination was captivated by Ritschl, the man, no less than by Ritschl, the philologist; and if those who never knew the illustrious scholar find the tone too enthusiastic, the judgment too partial, the whole make-up of the sketch too unphilological, let some allowance be made for the occasion.

Ritschl's importance in the history of the classical philology of the nineteenth century is great. He mediated between the narrower school of Hermann and the wider current of thought which is marked by the names of Wolf and Böckh and Karl Otfried Müller. He was rigidly just to the letter, but he read in every tittle of the letter the revelation of the spirit. No man could go out of his school without a thorough conviction of the necessity of exhaustive study. *Cum pulvisculo exhaurire* was one of his favorite phrases. No one could leave him without some appreciation of the impor-

¹ Friedrich Wilhelm Ritschl. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Philologie von OTTO RIBBECK. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, Erster Bd. 1879. Zweiter Band, 1881 (348 + 591 pp.). Ribbeck's book is, as the title implies, much more than a life of Ritschl; it is a valuable contribution to the history of philological studies and theories, and while few could spare the time to read more than nine hundred pages of mere biography, every one who wishes to follow the course of classical studies in our century must make himself acquainted with the contents of these volumes, so rich in statement, illustration, suggestion. For young students of philology, nothing can be more inspiring than the example of such a master as Ritschl, and if the sketch given above, which purposely dwells on the early period, preserves anything of the interest of the original memoir or leads any one to a closer acquaintance with Ribbeck's book, the insertion of this article will be in a measure justified.

tance of method. But what seems to me even now, at the distance of more than thirty years, the best thing about Ritschl, was not his accuracy, not his method, but the personal spirit that breathed out of the lecturer. Böckh was a great man, doubtless, but he read his yellow lectures with a serene sublimity, and uttered his classic sentences with a quiet self-satisfaction that awed but did not inspire. The man had taught all that to generations before: he had moulded the work of the philologists of nearly half a century, and it was hard to realize that the quiet, deliberate, old Privy Councillor had done so much, had thought so much. K. F. Hermann put a great deal of force into his immense erudition, but the force was directed at space and not at his hearers. Welcker was too benevolently poetic, too dreamy, too *sinnig* to seize upon an American mind. Of Schneidewin, who was as kind to me as ever teacher was to scholar, whose subtle, sometimes super-subtle, knowledge of Greek I learned to appreciate better year by year; of Bernays, then on the threshold of his high career, never, perhaps, more suggestive as a teacher than he was then, a man of rare gifts and telling power, a helper, too, at that time, to struggling neophytes: of these and others, I will not speak here. Enough that with Böckh, K. F. Hermann, Schneidewin in fresh remembrance, and Welcker and Bernays in actual presence, Ritschl was to me something apart. From the very first moment he led me captive, and though, during my year's sojourn at Bonn, I was never brought into any close personal intercourse with him, as I had been with Franz, in Berlin, with Schneidewin, in Göttingen, and with Bernays, I felt as if he had been my benefactor and my friend. Such was his loving interest in all his pupils that he remembered me through the lapse of years, welcomed me to the hospitality of his charming home when I returned to Bonn, in 1860: wrote me once a long letter in his superb hand; and on my recent visit to Germany, I found that, as a pupil of his, I was received as a friend of long standing by those who were nearest to him. If there were anything personal or exceptional in this, I should not mention it; but almost every one of the thousands who attended his courses faithfully could tell the same story. He radiated love and kindness. Of course there is another side. He was a pugnacious, high-tempered man, the old fighting blood of the Hartenbachs was in his veins, and the close of his life in Bonn was signalized by as bitter a feud as ever stirred the philological world, but I am glad to retain the memory of him

as a glorious man, faults and all. I have no doubt that part of his work will have to be done over, despite his care, despite his genius; but he was a man whom I am happy to have known at all, and happiest to have known in his best years, for, in 1852, he was forty-six years old, an age which is, for a philologist, the flush of youth. He stood when he lectured, his notes were there apparently for the fun of the thing, his gestures were animated, there was something almost French about his liveliness. His eyes, though shielded by spectacles, shone with excitement; his nose played a most important part in the drama, for he took snuff by the boxload, as it were, helping himself, at times, from the supply of a convenient student; his mouth went through the whole range of expression from rapt inspiration to bitter sarcasm. He was a thoroughly vivid personality, who stands before my mind as clearly to-day as in the spring months of more than thirty years since.

Friedrich Wilhelm Ritschl, whose remote ancestors were Bohemian noblemen, the Ritschls of Hartenbach, was the son of a country parson. Worse things might happen to a man than to be the son of a parson, and a country parson at that. It insures purity of atmosphere as well as poverty. It is to be born after all on the heights of character and thought. He first saw the light at the village of Gross-Vargula in the parish of Erfurt on Easter day, April 6, 1806. Erfurt is one of the principal towns of Thuringia, and Thuringia gave birth to F. A. Wolf and Lobeck.

When he was nine years old his father was promoted to a position in Erfurt itself, and his biographer thinks that the lad's spirit of observation was stirred by this city life. Anything sleepier than Erfurt I have seldom seen, though the cathedral is well perched and one remembers it among a forest of churches. Ritschl's father undertook to teach his son himself, usually a wretchedly bad plan. The father is lost in the teacher or the teacher in the father. One is vexed that one's own flesh and blood can be so stupid, or one lets one's own flesh and blood domineer hopelessly over him. Ritschl's father had the latter weakness. The boy hated memorizing, and so the father did not require him to memorize anything. No rules were learned, no list of words conned. Grammar and dictionary were consulted at every turn. A very bad plan, you will say. So it was. But your great scholars get at the apples of the Hesperides in all sorts of ways, swarm up the trees, throw sticks at the limbs, shake the trunk; very few of them have a regulation ladder and an approved apple-gatherer. So the youngster was

prepared by his father, and not badly prepared as it turned out, and at the age of thirteen he was in *secunda* of the Erfurt gymnasium. His principal teacher at that time was Spitzner, the Homeric scholar, a dragon of accuracy, keen and dry. Crab-apples are not a bad introduction to the more luscious fruit of which I have just spoken, and every boy may be thankful when he has a teacher who insists on that which is. So Ritschl had to thank Spitzner for his accuracy in some very arid studies, an accuracy which stood him in good stead years after. Ritschl's mother was evidently a bright woman, with a talent for managing the household that she did not hide in a napkin. His father was a quiet soul, who smoked his pipe, wrote prosy sermons, and let his wife manage the affairs of the universe, including the tie of his white cravat. Ritschl, who, like most of us, believed in heredity, recognized in himself something of his father's easy way of taking things, but his admiration was all for his mother, and she was the confidante of all his hopes and plans. In 1824, Ritschl, who was now in *prima*, followed his teacher Spitzner to Wittenberg, where he came under the influence of another Homeric scholar, K. W. Nitzsch, the well-known editor of the *Odyssey*. Both Spitzner and Nitzsch had been trained in the famous Schola Portana, and kept up the traditions of their school in exactness of grammatical knowledge and readiness in speaking and writing Latin. It appears that the plan of the gymnasium was far from being minutely methodical. Ample margin was left for private reading; and I would state here, by way of parenthesis, that I am myself a firm believer in margins of that kind. These early years are the most precious years for wide, discursive reading. When one settles down to the business of life, when one has to read for an object, when one has to read mainly in order to write, the charm and the glow, and often the real intellectual profit are gone. But in Wittenberg there was, after all, a general supervision of the reading, and the student was required to send in monthly or quarterly reports of what he had done, abstracts, essays, collations. Ritschl's Latin style, even in those early days, was well rounded and correct. He wrote Latin and Greek verses, Latin congratulatory addresses, Greek epics. There are worse employments. He left the school with the highest testimonials, although his faithful teacher did not fail to note the quickness of temper which was to bring him into great trouble in the closing years of his life.

On the 28th of March, 1825, he was matriculated as a student

at Leipzig. The *magnus Apollo* of Leipzig was Gottfried Hermann, then at the height of his renown. He was at that time sixty-three years of age, but he had more than twenty years of work in him, and he was a sturdy champion of the critico-grammatical school, who was to deal his adversaries some hard blows before he laid down his mace. To him a thorough knowledge of language and metre was the indispensable foundation. The focus of philological work was to be sought in the finding out what the text was and what the text meant. Attempts to reproduce ancient life by the study of history and antiquities found little favor in his eyes. Hellenism was to him the Greek writer. Böckh's conception of the mission of philology, *Erkenntniss des Erkannten*, Welcker's vision of Greek poetry, rising like an exhalation from the chemical treatment of insignificant fragments, Creuzer's nebulous and fantastic mythology, all roused the great scholar to do battle for what he considered the cause of sound learning. Those who despised him as a pedant he despised in turn as dilettanti, and he attacked without reserve Böckh's Pindar, Welcker's Trilogy, and at a later day, O. Müller's Eumenides. Hermann's polemic writings are not bad reading. His prefaces often contain capital hits. Some of his sentences have become proverbial among scholars. That he was narrow, prejudiced and often in the wrong is true, but it is impossible not to respect the old man in his toughness. The world has got beyond his grammar and his logic, his Kantianisms and his dogged translations of imaginary differences of Greek into imaginary differences of Latin. But he was a bold, strong man, knew his own mind perfectly and dominated his school.

Ritschl made a bad beginning. Like many German students he avenged himself for the restrictions of the gymnasium life by giving rein to the foolishnesses peculiar to German students. He joined a *corps* and ran to the same excess of riot with that class of young men. But he did not find the *Lusatia* a satisfying portion, and in order to get rid of his entanglements, he resolved to change his university, although with a pardonable weakness he was in after years a little proud of the extreme liveliness of his entrance upon student life. Most scholars, like Justice Shallow, recall with a certain satisfaction wild passages in early life, and fancy that the experience did them much good. But before he went away from Leipzig, as a matter of honor, he applied for admission to Hermann's *Societas Graeca*, and won it by a brilliant disputa-

tion, in which he swaggered vastly before an admiring audience. You see my hero was not a model. He was young and foolish, and being young and foolish he made all manner of sage reflections in his note-books. It was high time for him to get out of an atmosphere that he made unwholesome for himself, and he went to Halle with the firm resolve to redeem the lost time.

Ritschl matriculated at Halle, April 27, 1826. The university of Halle was flourishing at that time. It had 1200 students, chiefly, to be sure, in theology. Some of the professors had world-wide reputations. So, for instance, Gesenius and Tholuck. The great philological power of the place was Reisig, one of those men who, by the force of their genius, rather than by the massiveness of their work, have acquired an abiding name in the annals of philology. He was well to do and not hampered by considerations that cripple the lives of most scholars. So he began life with a good library, and when he went off to the wars he took with him a copy of the valuable second Juntine edition of Aristophanes. The fruit of these camp studies is the brilliant *Coniectanea in Aristophanem*, full of subtle metrical observations, of careful researches into Aristophanic usage, showing independence of judgment and a happy vein of invention and combination. It is a shining specimen of penetrating and creative criticism, says Ribbeck. In Jena he carried the students away by his personal bearing as well as by his brilliant lectures. Imagine, if you can, an enthusiastic audience at a 5 o'clock morning lecture on Greek or Latin grammar. He rigged himself out, as did his teacher, Gottfr. Hermann, in a riding-suit, top-boots, spurs, leather breeches and green hunting-coat, and came in this gear to lecture, roamed about with the students, dined with them, disputed in Latin and Greek on anything and everything, and when he made a discovery in the small hours of the night he would throw open his window and proclaim it to his neighbors. He was thirty-two years old when he was called to Halle, and there he exercised a powerful influence on Ritschl. A wonderful man, vivid, strong, direct. No careful elaborated lecture for him, a slip of paper with citations sufficed. His voice, his manner had, doubtless, a great deal to do with it, and those who resisted his magic influence had something to say about his cheap jokes, his abundant polemics, his dogmatic certainty. But he was unquestionably a great and inspiring teacher, and a teacher he desired to be above everything. A pupil of Hermann's, he was not satisfied with being a mere verbal philologist, and

Greek and Roman antiquities, mythology and archaeology were among the themes of his lectures. Admitted to Reisig's *Societas Philologica*, Ritschl rose early to the highest position, and no wonder, in view not only of his talent but of his hard work. He got up between five and six, did not go to bed until between eleven and twelve, eight hours daily being allotted to private study.

The death of Reisig, Jan. 1829, in Venice, whither he had gone in quest of the treasures of the S. Marco library, was a severe blow to Ritschl and the rest of his devoted scholars, but that death doubtless quickened the young disciple to a higher manhood. His companions had already dubbed him the future Reisig, and he soon entered upon his inheritance. After a period of longing for a position in Berlin, he determined to remain in Halle, and took his degree July 11, 1829, *summa cum laude*, as a matter of course. The dissertation which he had handed in was too bulky to be printed in time, and so he collected in hot haste a number of *Schedae criticae* from his previous studies, working three days and three nights with only nine hours' sleep. The manuscript went to the printers page by page, and at last three compositors were set to work on it, and thus the dissertation was brought to light. It is a painful but a glorious thing to work under such pressure, and Ritschl all his life long loved such concentrated effort. A few months afterward he qualified as a *privatdocent* at the University of Halle, and the treatise published on that occasion, the same that he had prepared for his doctor's degree, is still authoritative, *De Agathonis vita*. Ritschl was, all his life, a great discounter of hope. The ministry might give him a little something; he had an engagement to do some reviewing; there were the fees from the students and the chance of being employed in managing the reprints of good old books. In all he could count on some three or four hundred thalers. True, the ministry did recognize the character of Ritschl's early work, and sent his father a hundred thalers for the support of his promising son, and the opening of the course was such as seldom welcomes the young *privatdocent*. But he had to work at a ruinous pace. He had made no preparations in advance, and had to get up his lectures on the day on which they were delivered, working from four o'clock in the morning until five o'clock in the afternoon. Of course he was half dead when night came, and he sought the recreation that he needed in the society of Halle, which seems to have been gay enough for Halle. The German professor, no matter how hard at work he may be, almost always finds time for social enjoyment.

Ritschl began early to pay the drafts he had drawn upon his constitution, and many pages of his biography are taken up with detailed accounts of his sufferings. But it is enough to say that he was in some form or other a sufferer all his life. Carlyle's indigestion and Ritschl's rheumatism are indigestion and rheumatism, and cannot be made lovely. It is enough that we remember the drawback. Yet all Ritschl's sufferings never seemed to affect his flow of spirits; he was the life of every company, he loved poetry passionately, he loved music passionately, and he was much addicted to the frivolity of dancing before rheumatism laid him by the heels.

The details which Ribbeck gives at this point of Ritschl's method of work in these early years cannot be reproduced here, and yet they are of great interest and importance as showing how a great scholar is built up, how the fabric of learning is enlarged and consolidated. Ritschl worked from certain centres to the circumference until the circumferences touched and made new centres. This is the way of most great masters of erudition.

In the early part of his career Ritschl worked much more at Greek than at Latin and paid especial attention to the Greek grammarians. In fact he was engaged on an edition of Thomas Magister when he received his longed-for appointment as professor extraordinary. But the title brought him no money, and Ritschl's financial condition was desperate. The university beadies congratulated him on his promotion—he had no money to pay the usual fee. He wanted to buy candles for his lecture-room, but he had not the necessary eight groschen to give the stove-tender to purchase them with. On one occasion he sent for a locksmith to break open a lock and had not even a silver groschen to bestow on him, and so he had to order a key which he did not want so that the man might come again. It is a curious narrative—but who was to blame? A few pages further back we read that this impetuous young gentleman had a drawer full of white kid gloves. It is the old story—*Pourquoi se priver du superflu, quand on peut se passer du nécessaire?*

Ritschl looked about him in despair. But release was at hand, for he was soon afterwards elected professor extraordinary and joint director of the philological seminary in the university of Breslau with a salary of 500 thalers.

Breslau was at that time a dirty, lively, odoriferous city. The place was too big, society was too engrossing, and our young pro-

fessor wished for a year of solitary confinement so that he might work without distraction. The students were far below the level of the young men of Halle, the seminary was badly organized. But Ritschl soon leavened the lumpish mass and brought about a marked revival of Latinity among the students, who learned to love their brilliant and resolute teacher, and the attendance on his lectures increased. These lectures were those which he had delivered in Halle, widened and deepened, of course. It is true that some German professors spend as much time on their old lectures as would suffice scholars in other lands to write new, for I have compared notes taken in different years, and find immense differences; but after all the explanation how so many get over so much ground is to be sought in the early years of their professorial life, which they devote largely to getting up courses which shall serve them with additions and corrections for the rest of their academic career. In Breslau Ritschl added to his repertory, and I heard, in 1852, in Bonn, the courses which he prepared in Breslau in 1834 and 1835. Besides his professorship he was a member of the examining committee—he had a rare talent for administrative business—and joint manager of the museum of art and the numismatic cabinet, an office which widened his range of vision, so that he had the happiness of being a very busy man. In 1834, being twenty-eight years of age, he was made full professor, and took part in the work of the professor of eloquence, made Latin speeches and composed Latin letters in the name of the university.

Up to the end of the first Breslau period Ritschl had given a large part of his time and thought to Greek; thenceforth he was to be known chiefly as a Latinist. He had worked at Plautus both as a student and as a teacher in Halle. In Breslau his interest revived, and in January, 1834, he made a contract with the head of the famous Halle publishing concern, the Orphanhouse, for a great edition of Plautus in four volumes, of which the first was to appear in the course of that very year. Ritschl has been in his grave nearly seven years [1883] and the great Plautus is not yet finished. Every one who has ever contemplated a great work will sympathize with Ritschl. It is, as George Sand once said, so much more pleasant to talk about a big book that you are going to write than to hear other people talk about a big book that you have written. I cannot go into a detailed account of Ritschl's work on Plautus, his first essays, his mistaken views as to the licence of Plautus' verse and the integrity of the MSS of Plautus. He made, in a certain sense, a

false start, but he was preparing himself for the work of his life, and he was soon to reach the turning point, after which there is not much to record save philological successes, alternating with frightful spells of suffering.

It soon became evident to Ritschl, as to all Plautus scholars, that it was necessary to find out what was in the famous Ambrosian palimpsest of Milan before going further in the criticism of Plautus, and he obtained permission from the authorities and a very modest allowance for expenses, which they always call by a longer name than is generally warranted by the amount, *Unterstützung*. So Ritschl set out for Italy, the promised land of the philologist. For a scholar, a literary man, an artist, a residence in Italy is a new life. No one ever stepped into that stream and stepped out of that stream the same man. Goethe's Italian journey was the most momentous epoch in the development of his intellectual life, and he was older then than Byron was when he died. John Stuart Mill, in his autobiography, records with grateful feelings the privilege he had enjoyed of seeing the land of all lands for the scholar while he was yet young; and if any old student wishes to find out how much sensitive surface he has left, he should go to Italy. So the pages of Ritschl's life in Italy are for young and old among the most fascinating of his biography. He reached Trieste on the 7th of Nov., 1836, Verona on the 10th, Milan on the 11th. Apart from his wild enthusiasm over the cathedral, his life in Milan was a long wrestle with the Ambrosian palimpsest of Plautus. Others have wrestled with it since and extracted more of its secrets, but Ritschl's description of his struggle has lost none of its interest for the philologist by the lapse of half a century. "The beautiful old writing has been scratched out on both sides, and on both sides written over with an abominable thick, black, fat writing, containing worthless pieces from the Vulgate of the Old T. The chemical reagents employed have made such havoc that in many places even the upper writing is not to be made out, much less the under, that very many lines and whole leaves have been eaten up, that often there is nothing left of the whole leaf except the four margins, often the whole leaf consists merely of a little system of islands and peninsulas of small strips and scraps, either disconnected or else loosely united at points." I spare you the details of his work in the cold library, where he toiled over the MS with two entire suits of clothes on, under and upper both, felt overshoes, cloak on, hat on, and two

pairs of silk gloves on. He remained in Milan five weeks, during which time he had made himself intimately acquainted with the city and its treasures. Thence to Genoa, which he reached on the 23d. Florence was reached before the end of the year, Rome on the 12th of January. In Rome he remained until the 9th of May. On the 15th he was in Florence again, on the 31st back in Milan, to wrestle with the palimpsest, where he remained, with the exception of sundry excursions, until the 2d of August. The south of Italy he had reserved for a future which was not to come. The winter of 1836-7 was one of the hardest winters ever known in Italy, and yet it was a time of enjoyment, of expansion, of great gain. He came back, his head teeming with plans, a *fata Morgana* before his inspired vision. The plans were not executed, the views faded away, but the power remained, the clear eye had become clearer, the flight bolder, steadier.

Ritschl's return to Breslau was marked by a fresh and vigorous activity in authorship and teaching; and the struggle with the narrow fortunes of his position was terminated by a call to Bonn as the successor of Ferdinand Naeke. He reached Bonn on the 15th of April, 1839. He left it in anger and in sorrow in 1865. I will not go into the details of these twenty-six years of work: for a large part of which time Ritschl was the leading spirit of the university. There were other scholars of great merit there, and I do not underrate the reputation and the usefulness of such a man as Welcker, but when we speak of the Bonn school we think of Ritschl and Ritschl alone. But I cannot, at this time, undertake to characterize the school that he founded. I can merely take a few fragments out of his own principles of philological study—principles which have not perished with the man who gave utterance to them.

Some of the aphorisms, mere memoranda that have been found among his early papers, show that the young critic had clear notions of his work. So he exacts "preliminary knowledge," he would not have the student rush into textual criticism without training in language, without full acquaintance with the theme. "The opinions of the predecessors must be known." Hundreds of emendations are put forward anew, and that not by mean men and ignorant novices, but by the lights of our profession: not from wilful dishonesty, but simply in a spirit of vanity and laziness. "No prejudices." "Fix clearly in your eye what you are after." "Don't be satisfied with half notions, squinting thoughts. Pene-

trate into the heart of the matter with your interpretation." "Don't glide over what you don't understand." "Don't admit to yourself that there is more than one right." "Distinguish sharply between the possible and the impossible." "Cultivate the feeling of truth." (Bentley being the model held up.) "Never grow weary in trying to find ways." "Don't try to explain everything." "Don't go into criticism until you exhaust hermeneutics." "Hold the mean between audacity and timidity."

All self-evident, you say, but none the less necessary. These rules are violated at every turn to-day. The man who began in this way was likely to do good work as a critic and as a teacher, and it is much to be regretted that he never carried out his intention of writing a series of letters on the study of philology. In the fragments and outlines that remain he evinces his faith in the inexhaustible magnetism of classical studies, in spite of all the cry about their effeteness. Philology is a science and must be studied as a science, even by those who are only going to do elementary work as teachers. The good teacher must ever, as a teacher, hear more and know more than he needs to impart, both in quantity and quality, and the quantum that is chosen and weighed out for immediate information, for practical purposes, must be brought out of abundance, out of depth. No matter how small that quantum be, it must have in it the germ of intellectual development. The teacher, how humble soever his vocation, must have a scientific possession that outstretches the immediate business of his calling, in order that he may not become fatigued and dulled by the monotony of his office. The consciousness of working independently at the great cathedral structure of science, keeps him atop; and the delight of intellectual work, of making something, cannot be replaced by aught else. This delight is contagious, it animates, it excites wonderfully. Look at the gymnasias! he cries. If you find one teacher of intellectual idealism in a gymnasium, and ten uncreative or ignorantly enthusiastic teachers—mere ridiculous jackpuddings these latter—the one will carry the dead wood and the touchwood of the ten: the scholars will follow him, and he will give the whole school tone and character. In your encyclopaedic teachers he did not believe in the least. "Enthusiasm dwells only in specialization." Philology has enlarged itself more and more, and looks forward to union with history. But so long as men are men, there must be specialization. We are here to work, not to enjoy. Whatever else the philologist knows, he must know the ancient languages thoroughly, and his

cry was "Read, read much, read very much, read as much as possible," and yet another sentence of his was "A problem must leave you no rest or peace, by day or by night, until it is solved."

These are good words, but as was said in the beginning of this paper, the secret of his art, the secret of which he himself was fully conscious, lay in the temper of the man himself. "No cleverness," he says, "no vision can attain what only a warm human heart can accomplish—a heart for the study, a heart for the students."

Of Ritschl's seminary work I have found an excellent account, condensed from Ribbeck, by Professor J. H. Wright, in a paper on "The Place of Original Research in College Education," read before the National Educational Association in the summer of 1882, and it may be well to reproduce it here.

"The Bonn Philological Seminary as it was between 1839 and 1865, under the directorship of Friedrich Ritschl, is a striking illustration of the wonderful power of a useful institution when inspired by a man of genius. Ritschl's fame as a scholar, and his skill as a director, attracted, for many years, ambitious young men from all parts of Germany, and from other lands. His seminary became a busy workshop, the centre of university life, and thus the source of influences that were felt all over the civilized world. It became the model seminary, and Ritschl was frequently asked for advice by scholars in various lands who wished to establish similar institutions.

"In a letter to a Greek professor in Finland, who had asked him for suggestions, Ritschl gives his views as to the value, object, and essential features of an ideal seminary. His words have an importance quite beyond the occasion which called them forth. Ritschl asserts that if classical studies flourish in Germany more than in other lands, the cause is to be found nowhere else than in the philological seminaries of her universities. As an incidental proof he calls attention to the total revolution that had taken place in Austrian higher education within a generation. It was only within that period that seminaries and the methods of seminary training had been introduced into the Austrian universities, and the results were a thoroughly competent corps of gymnasial teachers, and a reformed higher education, in which Austria, at the time of his writing, was not behind her sister states. The greatest need for the higher education is competent gymnasial teachers. For the training of these more is needed at the university than the mere hearing of lectures. Lectures present only the theory and items

of knowledge: they work upon the student's mind from without. The future teacher needs, more than anything else, skill and method in his studies, and these can be gained only by the exercise of his powers and by putting to practical use knowledge already obtained. The seminary does not now have directly in view the practical training of young men as future teachers; skill in teaching is won only by the actual practice of the profession. The seminary endeavors to bring about independent personal activity; it disciplines men to facility and skill in research. It does this by requiring that studies shall proceed from a critical and scientific basis according to exact methods. The intellectual operations thus performed by the student himself and not merely heard about, as when he listens to lectures, become part of his flesh and blood, his own inalienable property. 'For my part,' continues Ritschl, 'I will not withhold a twofold confession. The best that there is in me as regards philology, I owe to seminary exercises under my teachers Gottfried Hermann, in Leipzig, and Karl Reisig, in Halle; and the best that I have done as a university professor, at all events the most tangible, the most permanent good that I have wrought, has been in the work of the seminaries over which, for thirty years, I have had the good fortune to preside. . . . There is one condition that is absolutely essential to a successful seminary: all its members must be thoroughly grounded (*sattelfest*) in the grammar of the classical languages. The seminary is not the continuation of the gymnasium. . . . In about four years after the establishment of a well-managed seminary, there will go forth a band of skilful scholars, competent to teach; six years later the number of teachers thus trained will be large enough to exert a marked influence upon the education of your country, and in fifteen years your schools will be in the hands of an entirely new generation of teachers.' In a subsequent paper, Ritschl expresses the belief that young men ought to enter the seminary early enough to allow them to spend at least two years in its work before leaving the university. The younger the members of the seminary, the deeper and more permanent is the influence exerted upon them.

"Ritschl devoted himself tirelessly to this work, giving up his time, his strength, his books, for the sake of his disciples; never, however, doing it in such a way as to relieve them from the necessity of doing most of the work themselves. He never, for example, gave a man a subject to work upon, either in the seminary or for a doctor's dissertation, though often he suggested themes from which a selection might be made. In his conduct of the seminary,

as in his public lectures, there was a kingly power about him. Latin was the only language to be heard in the seminary, except when at times, in order indirectly to rebuke stupidity or slovenly work, he would drop into drastic German, as if the Latin were unintelligible to the delinquent. The work of the seminary was often planned with great system. For a given time it would gather upon a connected group of subjects, and the combined results of these special studies were often an important contribution to science and to literary history. Thus it was now that certain poets were studied; now historians and orators, philosophers, grammarians; subjects approached from various points of view, as the biographical, the critical, the linguistic, the literary. Many of the most brilliant enterprises of recent classical scholarship were conceived in this seminary, though years may often have elapsed before maturity. This institution filled the higher schools and gymnasia of Germany, and to a certain extent the philological chairs in the universities, with skilful teachers, with men who, by actual practice, had learned to investigate, to think for themselves, and to treat their themes with masterly hand.

"Ritschl profoundly impressed himself, his ideals and his convictions upon all who came in contact with him. His conception of the character and object of philological study has thus become, through the wide-spread influence of his pupils, the conception of all educated Germany. Under Ritschl's influence young men came to feel a vital interest in their work, to entertain profound convictions as to the dignity and high value of scholarship. Classical literature and the monumental remains of ancient art were to them no longer so many scattered, disconnected fragments, interesting as mere curiosities, for the entertainment of the pedant, or for the amusement of the lover of bric-a-brac. What has survived to us from the past is rather the ruin of a wonderful civilization, and classical studies have their noblest activity in the reconstruction of this lost world. It is work of the highest order; it calls into play the profoundest energies of the mind of man. There is nothing in the past, however obscure, but that by right investigation it may be found out. Every student should have his own especial part in the work, coming to it with his best skill, and performing it, because of his concentration and singleness of aim, better than it could be done by any one else in the world."

During the last ten years of Ritschl's life in Bonn he had much to suffer physically and mentally. In November, 1854, Jahn was called to Bonn, with the heartiest support on the part of Ritschl.

At first their relations were cordial, but a coolness soon set in, and the friends became sworn foes. I do not yield to any one in admiration of German learning, conscientiousness, inventiveness, grasp, but the more I have seen of the arrogance, the jealousy, the hateful manœuvring, the shameful backbiting, the hatred, envy, malice, and all uncharitableness, which a closer knowledge of the professor's life in Germany reveals, the more glad am I to live where, if such abominations exist, they do not, like the frogs of Egypt, go up and come into our houses and into our bedchambers and upon our beds and upon our ovens and into our kneading troughs.

I will not enter into the details of the quarrel which divided Bonn into two hostile camps, the Ritschelians, and the Janizaries, as the partizans of Jahn were called. Both the great scholars have passed away. Jahn was a man of stupendous learning, well-ordered, compact, clear: he was a man of fine artistic sense, companionable, generous; but I should have sided with my old teacher, doubtless, through thick and thin, and should not have been a good judge of the merits of the case. The feud and the various entanglements issuing from it led to Ritschl's resignation, which was a blow to his scholars all over the world. In 1865 some of us had other things to think of than the shifting of a German professor from one university to another. Some of us were going to work, with what heart we could, to build up again the ruins of our own schools and colleges. But it was a blow even to us, and when I was last in Bonn I was glad to see that the house had been altered by the new owners past recognition.

From Bonn Ritschl went to Leipzig.

The University of Leipzig has risen very rapidly in the last fifteen or twenty years. When I was a student in Germany, few philologists thought of going to a school which had once been honored by the greatest master of his time. There is no guarantee of perpetuity in Germany, as the waxing and waning fortunes of various universities show. A certain amount of patronage from the neighborhood may be expected, but the university depends on its men, and the statesmen, the princes who know how to get the best man can be sure of the greatest university. The call of Ritschl was one of a number of decided measures that gave Leipzig a new life. The gap caused by Ritschl's departure from Bonn could not be filled except by Ritschl's own pupils. Jahn soon fell sick, and died more than six years before his antagonist: and Bonn, although classical philology is nobly represented there by such

men as Bücheler and Usener, has not regained its numbers. In 1860 Leipzig's classical philology was at so low an ebb that there were only twenty-three philologists at the university. With the coming of George Curtius, the number rose until it reached 71. Ritschl had as many as 222 in one of his classes. Honors were showered upon him, and the last years of his life, tortured as he was by pain, and crippled by rheumatism and other sickness, were spent to the very latest breath in work for his department, and in loving services to his pupils.

On the 31st of October, 1876, he asked for release from current work. "For ninety-five semesters have I, with God's help, been able to exercise my office, perhaps not wholly without result. If an undesired end should be put to my work in my 71st year, I must be thankful for what I have enjoyed, and try to resign myself, but not without pain and sorrow." On the fourth of November a half year's furlough was granted. On the night of the eighth of November he was called away. Just before he died, when his mind began to wander, news was brought to him of a favorite pupil. His mind became steady again, and he spoke at some length of the plans and aims of his young friend, whose every step he had carefully watched, and he sent him, as his last greeting, the words: I wish him happiness and success according to the measure of my sufferings.¹

I have not time to recount his achievements as a philologist, to indicate the work he did in criticism, in grammar, in epigraphics, to show how he incited men of the most various bent to honest, effective, whole-souled undertakings, each in his own sphere; and I will only say that while Germany has had and still has great teachers, while there have been and are many men whose lectures were and are more methodical, richer in detailed information, lectures that serve in after years as storehouses of learning, Germany has seen very few who could mould and fashion and inspire their pupils as Ritschl did his.

Much of our science passes away: the theory of to-day pushes away the theory of yesterday, to be thrust away in turn by the theory of to-morrow. One by one books, like men, drop into the night, and shade is lost in shadow. What is not lost, what lives forever, is the spirit of love to learning and love to the learner, which, once kindled, passes from teacher to learner, onward to the end of time.

BASIL L. GILDERSLEEVE.

¹ The favorite pupil was the lamented Gustav Löwe.

NOTES.

NOTE ON A PASSAGE IN THE GORGIAS OF PLATO.

In the *Gorgias*, p. 497A, the following passage occurs:

ΣΩ. Οὐκ ἄρα τὸ χαίρειν ἐστὶν εὖ πράττειν οὐδὲ τὸ ἀνιάσθαι κακῶς ; ὥστε ἕτερον γίγνεται τὸ ἡδὺ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ.

ΚΑΛ. Οὐκ οἶδ' ἅττα σοφίζει, ὦ Σώκρατες.

ΣΩ. Οἶσθα, ἀλλ' ἀκκίζει, ὦ Καλλίκλεις. καὶ πρόθι γ' ἔτι εἰς τὸ ἔμπροσθεν, ὅτι ἔχων ληρεῖς, ἵν' εἰδῆς ὡς σοφὸς ὢν με νουθετεῖς. οὐχ ἅμα διψῶν τε ἕκαστος ἡμῶν πέπανται καὶ ἅμα ἡδόμενος διὰ τοῦ πίνειν ;

ΚΑΛ. Οὐκ οἶδα ὅτι λέγεις.

The difficulty in this passage lies in the clause *ὅτι ἔχων ληρεῖς* of the second *ῥῆσις* of Sokrates. Remove these words from their place in the sentence and you have a clear and appropriate sense: "This is pretending, Kallikles; you know well enough. Yes, and keep right on a while longer and you will know how wise a man you are who try to set me right." *Πρόθι*—*εἰς τὸ ἔμπροσθεν* here means, as the context shows, and as Dr. Thompson well renders, "Answer a few more questions." Now, as the phrase *ὅτι ἔχων ληρεῖς* stands, *ὅτι* cannot be the conjunction of indirect discourse, for some word, *λέγων*, *ἀποκρινόμενος* or the like, would be required for it to depend upon; nor can it be the relative *ὅτι*, and to give it the force of 'because' is to introduce a reason where none is required and where too it would be utterly misplaced.

Three solutions of the difficulty, and so far as I know, only three, have been proposed. 1. To strike the words out altogether. 2. To alter the distribution of the dialogue by giving the words from *καὶ πρόθι* to *νουθετεῖς* inclusive to Kallikles, on the ground that *ὅτι ἔχων ληρεῖς* comes more appropriately from him. 3. To transfer the words to the second *ῥῆσις* of Kallikles, substituting *ἔχων ληρεῖς* for *λέγεις*.

To the first Dr. Woolsey reasonably objects "That *ὅτι ἔχων ληρεῖς*, a choice Attic expression, has not the air of a gloss, and it is not easy to say what it is a gloss upon."

To the second Dr. Thompson objects that "Even so the clause *ὅτι ἔχων ληρεῖς* is in the way: nor is there much point in the next

clause, *ἐν' εἰδῆς*, as coming from Callicles. In the mouth of Socrates it is an apt retort to *οὐκ οἶδ' ἅττα σοφίζει*, as if he had said, 'You blame me *διὰ τὸ σοφίζεσθαι*, answer a few more questions and you will discover that *you* are no *σοφός*.' And Dr. Woolsey says: "As Callicles wishes to break off the discourse, *πρῶτι εἰς τοῦμπροσθεν* is not what *he* would say."

There remains the third proposition, which Dr. Thompson seems inclined to adopt, thinking the phrase "comes more naturally from Callicles." But is there no other place nearer hand to which the words may be transferred? And can they not be retained in the *ῥῆσις* of Sokrates? I venture to answer these questions in the affirmative. Why not place these troublesome words after *νουθετεῖς*? *ὅτι* could then be taken as the conjunction of indirect discourse, dependent upon the idea of saying implied in *νουθετεῖς*. In this case the conjunction would have the function of the inverted commas in English, and the subject of *ληρεῖς* would be Sokrates, not Kallikles. The sense would be: "Answer a few more questions and you will know what wisdom is yours who try to set me right by saying 'you are talking nonsense.'" Does this sense suit the context? Dr. Woolsey says: "*νουθετεῖς* can only point at the advice given by Callicles to Sokrates," on pp. 484-486. Doubtless there is an allusion to that advice; but subsequently in 488A, just before beginning his "dialectical attack" upon the position of Kallikles that natural and conventional justice were different things, Sokrates says: *σὺ οὖν, ὥσπερ ἤρξω νουθετεῖν με, μὴ ἀποστής, ἀλλ' ἱκανῶς μοι ἔνδειξαι τί ἐστὶ τοῦτο ὃ ἐπιτηδευτέον μοι, καὶ τίνα τρόπον κτησάμην ἂν αὐτό*, and again, in 489D, Sokrates says: *καί, ὃ θαυμάσιε, πραότερόν με προδιδασκε, ἵνα μὴ ἀποφουτήσω παρὰ σοῦ*. This is Socratic irony, of course, but Kallikles, though his reply to this last (*εἰρωνεύει, ὃ Σώκρατες*) shows he felt the irony, still keeps up the superior tone of the practical man of the world in the presence of the pedantic philosopher. Of what sort then was the *νουθέτησις* of Kallikles in response to the above-quoted request of Sokrates? In 489B he says: *οὔτοσιν ἀνὴρ οὐ παύσεται φλυαρῶν. εἰπέ μοι, ὃ Σώκρατες, οὐκ αἰσχύνει, τηλικούτος ὢν, ὀνόματα θηρεύων*. In 490C: *Σιτία λέγεις καὶ ποτὰ καὶ ἱατροὺς καὶ φλυαρίας*. 490E: *ποῖα ὑποδήματα φλυαρεῖς ἔχων*; and just below *ὥς αἰ ταῦτα λέγεις, ὃ Σώκρατες*. In 491E: *ὥς ἡδὺς εἶ!* In 492C he winds up his tirade against temperance thus: *τρυφή καὶ ἀκολασία καὶ ἐλευθερία, ἐὰν ἐπικουρίαν ἔχῃ, τοῦτ' ἐστὶν ἀρετὴ τε καὶ εὐδαιμονία· τὰ δὲ ἄλλα ταῦτ' ἐστὶ τὰ καλλωπίσματα, τὰ παρὰ φύσιν συνθήματα, ἀνθρώπων φλυαρία καὶ οὐδενὸς ἀξία*. 494D: *ὥς ἀτοπος εἶ, ὃ Σώκρατες, καὶ ἀτεχνῶς δημηγόρος*. 494E:

οὐκ αἰσχύνει εἰς τοιαῦτα ἄγων, ὃ Σώκρατες, τοὺς λόγους. Finally, in the present passage: οὐκ οἶδ' ἅττα σοφίζει, ὃ Σώκρατες. In all of these cases the tone is the same; φλυαρία, φλυαρεῖν, or words of similar import are the only replies that come to the lips of Kallikles when pressed by the arguments of his opponent; they form the substance of the νουθέτησις, "the setting right" which Sokrates had asked of him. Sokrates had already rebuked Kallikles, but had in doing so alluded only to the peculiarities of his attitude at the moment; now the rebuke applies to the general tone assumed by Kallikles throughout the argument, and in what way could this, in the light of the expressions I have cited, be better done than by saying ἢ εἰδῆς ὡς σοφὸς ὦν με νουθετεῖς ὅτι ἔχων ληρεῖς?

Dr. Thompson remarks also, that the question οὐχ ἅμα κ. τ. λ., "comes in abruptly." "We should have expected," he says, "Πρόειμι δὴ, or some such prefatory formula." A particle of transition, it seems to me, would answer the purpose quite as well, and I suggest the insertion of ἀλλ' before οὐχ ἅμα. Compare 494E: Ἦ γὰρ ἐγὼ ἄγω ἐνταῦθα, ὃ γενναῖε, ἢ ἐκεῖνος ὃς ἂν φῇ ἀνέδην οὕτω τοὺς χαίροντας, ὅπως ἂν χαίρωσιν, εὐδαιμόνας εἶναι, καὶ μὴ διορίζεται τῶν ἡδονῶν ὅποιαι ἀγαθαὶ καὶ κακαί; ἀλλ' ἔτι καὶ νῦν λέγε, πότερον φῆς εἶναι τὸ αὐτὸ ἡδὺ καὶ ἀγαθόν κ. τ. λ. Here, after rebuking Kallikles for the charge he had made, Sokrates resumes the discussion, introducing his question by the use of ἀλλά. Just below, 495 A: οὐ τοίνυν ὀρθῶς ποιῶ οὐτ' ἐγώ, εἴπερ ποιῶ τοῦτο, οὔτε σύ, ἀλλ' ὃ μακάριε, ἄθρει μὴ οὐ τοῦτο ἢ τὸ ἀγαθόν, τὸ πάντως χαίρειν, κ. τ. λ. Here also ἀλλά introduces the resumption of the interrupted argument. May not the same word have been used in the passage before us? Supposing that the sentence originally ran ἀλλ' οὐχ ἅμα κ. τ. λ., it is not difficult to account for the disappearance of ἀλλ'; ΔΛ might easily be mistaken for Μ, and some would-be corrector, reading, as he supposed, ἄμ' οὐχ ἅμα κ. τ. λ., would quite naturally strike out ἄμ' as tautological. For these reasons I suggest the reading: καὶ προῖθι γ' ἔτι εἰς τὸ ἐμπροσθεν, ἵνα εἰδῆς ὡς σοφὸς ὦν με νουθετεῖς ὅτι ἔχων ληρεῖς. ἀλλ' οὐχ ἅμα διψῶν τε ἕκαστος ἡμῶν πέπανται καὶ ἅμα ἡδόμενος διὰ τοῦ πίνειν;

W. A. LAMBERTON.

REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES.

An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary, based on the manuscript collections of the late JOSEPH BOSWORTH, D. D., F. R. S. Edited and enlarged by T. NORTHCOKE TOLLER, M. A. Part I, A-Fir. Part II, Fir-Hwi. Oxford, at the Clarendon Press, 1882. pp. 576.

A New English Dictionary on Historical Principles; founded mainly on the materials collected by the Philological Society. Edited by JAMES A. H. MURRAY, LL. D., with the assistance of many scholars and men of science. Part I, A-Ant. Oxford, at the Clarendon Press. New York, Macmillan & Co., 1884. pp. xvi, 352.

English lexicography is at last beginning to receive the attention it deserves and requires. The publication of the works above mentioned, of the second especially, will carry beyond the narrow circle of scholars the much-needed public information that the English language has a history, a history which every English-speaking man and woman should know; and that the English language did not begin with Shakspeare, nor even with Chaucer—an old story, but one hitherto much neglected. Prof. Toller has done well to re-edit Bosworth's Anglo-Saxon Dictionary, first published in 1838,—*how* well, critics are still engaged in discussing. That the work needed re-editing no one will deny. Every Anglo-Saxon scholar has long felt the want of such a dictionary. The original work has been long out of print, and even if accessible, could not answer the demands of modern scholarship. Bosworth's Compendious Anglo-Saxon and English Dictionary (1860) is too meagre to serve any but the most elementary purposes, so that English scholars were dependent upon German works, especially Grein's invaluable Glossary to the Poetry (1861-64), and the glossaries attached to special works, as that of Heyne to "Beowulf," the best of its kind. Ettmüller's and Leo's Lexicons do not come into consideration, for the repelling arrangement of these works will always prevent their general use. The republication of Bosworth was then necessary, and Prof. Toller informs us that "Dr. Bosworth devoted much time and labor to the preparation of a second edition of his dictionary, but at the time of his death [in 1876] only the 288 pages which form Part I of the present issue had been finally revised by him"; and further, that "So much progress had been made with some succeeding sheets that it would have been a matter of considerable difficulty to make any but slight alterations in them. Consequently, after careful consideration, it was thought better to leave unchanged in the text certain points which would have involved extensive modifications, and, when the work should be complete, to note such in the preface or appendix." These quotations give Prof. Toller's point of view. I rather think that he would have done better to make the necessary alterations in the work itself, even at the expenditure of considerable time and labor, for this work, when completed,

will have to serve as the standard Anglo-Saxon dictionary for many years to come. Moreover, Bosworth's views of Anglo-Saxon phonology are completely antiquated, and a modern editor cannot afford to follow them. As to the treatment of *æ* and the separation of the short from the long vowels—both points referred to by Prof. Toller—with respect to the first, *æ* might have been treated alphabetically along with *a*, as Prof. Zupitza has treated it in the glossary to his edition of Cynewulf's *Elene*, or it might have been treated separately immediately after *a*, but it should not have been treated as *ae*. The separation of short from long vowels in the alphabetical list is altogether unnecessary, as Profs. Toller and Zupitza rightly think; in fact, the alphabetical arrangement of Zupitza's brief glossary may be taken as a model by future editors, for it shows, in this respect, a decided advance upon Heyne's arrangement. A more important matter, however, and one not so readily overlooked, is the phonetic quality of *æ*. Prof. Toller simply repeats Bosworth's older statements, *e. g.*, Bosworth: "The short or unaccented Anglo-Saxon *æ* seems to have been a slight lengthening of the short *a*, approaching to *ae* or *ai* in *faery* or *fairy*, as appears from these cognate words: *wael*, wail; *braedan*, to braid; *naegel*, a nail, etc." Toller: "The short or unaccented Anglo-Saxon *æ* has a sound like *ai* in *main* and *fairy*, as appears from these cognate words: *wael*, wail; *braedan*, to braid; *naegel*, a nail, etc." While no longer calling *æ* "a slight lengthening of the short *a*," Prof. Toller leaves unchanged Bosworth's statement as to its pronunciation. Further, Bosworth says: "The long or accented *ē* is found in the following words which are represented by English terms of the same signification, having *ea* sounded as in *deal*, *fear*; *dæl*, *fær*, etc." Toller: "The long or accented *ē* has the sound of *ea* in *meat*, *sea*. The *ē* is found in the following words, which are represented by English terms of the same signification, having *ea* sounded as in *deal*, *fear*; *dæl*, *fær*, etc." These views as to the sound of short *æ* and long *ē* are totally at variance with those advocated by modern Anglo-Saxon scholars. Again, Bosworth says: "The *ē* is often changed into *d*, as *stēnen*, stony, *stān*, a stone; *lār*, *lār*, lore"; and Toller repeats the statement *verbatim*. This is a decided instance of "cart before the horse," and if we look under *a* we find it reversed. Bosworth says: "The long *d* is often changed into *ē*, as *lēdr*, lore, *Iran*, to teach," which also we find repeated *verbatim* in Toller, with the addition of "*ān*, one; *ānig*, any"; so that apparently *d* and *ē* interchange *ad libitum*. The phenomena of *umlaut* (mutation) do not seem to be comprehended yet in England, notwithstanding Mr. Sweet's energetic labors, and dialectic variations receive no consideration. It is to be hoped that when Prof. Toller gets to *i* he will not follow Bosworth and say: "The Anglo-Saxon long or accented *i* had the sound of *i* in *tine*, *fine*, in these cognate words: *tine*, *fīndan* [!], *wīn*," etc. The late Dr. Bosworth deserves great credit for his valuable services, but his ideas of Anglo-Saxon phonetics should not be taught to the present generation.

The deficiencies of this dictionary have been commented on by Mr. J. Platt in the Transactions of the Philological Society (1882-3-4), by Prof. Wülcker in *Anglia* (V, Anzeiger, Heft 4), and by Prof. Heyne in *Englische Studien* (VII, Heft 1), who is more complimentary than either of the other critics, and praises as it deserves the industry and labor expended on the work, but does not hesitate

to note its shortcomings, and supplies many omitted words. Prof. Wülcker complains that Prof. Toller has incorporated Grein's Glossary into Bosworth's Dictionary, but he could not have neglected that work, and has acknowledged his obligations by the prominence given to Grein's references, although these obligations might have been more distinctly stated in the "Preliminary Notice." The large number of examples and references shows that Prof. Toller has not spared labor, and the almost entire lack of any adequate helps to ascertaining the vocabulary of Anglo-Saxon *prose* works should cause critics to be lenient in judging omissions of words. A cursory comparison of a few columns of Grein's Glossary, s. l. H, with the corresponding words in Part II, prepared by Prof. Toller himself, shows, as was to be expected, numerous additions from the Anglo-Saxon prose vocabulary, and s. v. *han-créd*, where Grein has but *one* example from the whole body of Anglo-Saxon poetry (Seel. 68), Prof. Toller gives at least *ten* from the prose. Much space is taken up in the repetition of references for the same example, as no less than three for the word above mentioned, "Exon. 99a; Th. 370, 32; Seel. 68." Also, in respect to proper names, which are rightly included, the dictionary emulates the encyclopaedia, and even long extracts, with translation, are given, as under "Beowulf" *twenty-four* lines from Thorpe's edition—in which article, by the way, we are informed that Beowulf was "a relation of Hrothgar," and that this poem "must have been translated into Anglo-Saxon by a Christian—perhaps in the reign of Canute, about A. D. 1020." These things ought not so to be. So too under "Brunan-burh," after a long account of the battle and the locality, we have *thirty-six* lines, with translation, from the poem as printed in Dr. Guest's History of English Rhythms. This seems to be an unnecessary consumption of valuable space in a dictionary. It may be added that the only omitted word found in Grein in the columns compared as above was *hangelle*, with example from the Riddles (45⁶).

Whatever may be said of the omissions and other shortcomings of the work—and Prof. Toller is well aware of their existence—the dictionary supplies a long-felt want. There is nothing to take its place, and it is to be hoped that Prof. Toller will be able to complete it speedily. Heyne's advice (*Englische Studien*, VII 135, ad fin.) would, however, be well heeded, as, in that event, the value of the two parts still to come, forming the second half of the work, would be much increased, and we should have an Anglo-Saxon dictionary that we might well be proud of.

The publication of the first part of the Philological Society's New English Dictionary, edited by the President of the Society, Dr. J. A. H. Murray, marks an era in English lexicography. Planned over twenty-five years ago, and more than two million quotations soon collected, intermitted for many years, and resumed under its present editorship only five years ago, since which time more than one million additional quotations have been collected, this monumental work now appears in a first part of 352 pages (large 4to), one-fourth of the first of six volumes, the number estimated as requisite for its completion.¹ It is not a matter of regret that this work did not appear sooner.

¹ The number of words included in this part is 8365, more than double the number in the corresponding portion of Webster's dictionary and supplement, and taking this part as a basis of calculation, we are told that the whole work will contain 187,792 *main* entries, or 231,115 entries all together. Of the 6797 *main* words in this part, 1998, or 29 per cent., are marked as obsolete, and 321 as foreign or imperfectly naturalized.

The twenty years publications of the Early English Text Society, and the amount of other work done in English philology during that period, have only now rendered possible the preparation of an English dictionary "on historical principles," and we may now expect a much more thorough and comprehensive work than was possible twenty-five years ago, before the origins of English had been so extensively studied. Dr. Murray's brief Preface and his General Explanations state with sufficient fullness the aim and plan of the work.

"The aim of this dictionary," says he, "is to furnish an adequate account of the meaning, origin, and history of English words now in general use, or known to have been in use at any time during the last *seven hundred* years. It endeavors (1) to show, with regard to each individual word, when, how, in what shape, and with what signification it became English; what development of form and meaning it has since received; which of its uses have, in the course of time, become obsolete, and which still survive; what new uses have since arisen, by what processes, and when; (2) to illustrate these facts by a series of quotations ranging from the first known occurrence of the word to the latest, or down to the present day, the word being thus made to exhibit its own history and meaning; and (3) to treat the etymology of each word on the basis of historical fact and in accordance with the methods and results of modern philological science." This is a more ambitious aim than has ever before been proposed for an English dictionary, and its execution leaves little to be desired. The limit of the Vocabulary, which Dr. Murray represents by the following diagram,



is hard to define. The lexicographer "must include all the 'common words' of literature and conversation, and such of the scientific, technical, slang, dialectal, and foreign words as are passing into common use and approach the position or standing of 'common words,' well knowing that the line which he draws will not satisfy all critics." He well says, "No one man's English is *all* English. The lexicographer must be satisfied to exhibit the greater part of the vocabulary of *each* one, which will be immensely more than the whole vocabulary of *any* one." That these principles are correct will not be disputed, and it is, therefore, surprising what out-of-the-way words have been thought worthy of inclusion.

Another important point to settle was the chronological *terminus a quo*. "The living vocabulary is no more permanent in its constitution than definite in its extent. It is not to-day what it was a century ago, still less what it will be a century hence." "Our own words never become obsolete; it is always

the words of our grandfathers that have died with them." How far back then shall we go in constructing an historical English dictionary? The ideal dictionary would include all words that ever were English, from the earliest Old English remains to the present day. But the English of King Alfred and his successors for wellnigh three hundred years, down to the breaking up of those systematic inflexions which distinguish the Anglo-Saxon from the transition English, is so homogeneous as to deserve a separate treatment, and here Prof. Toller's edition of Bosworth should serve as the historical basis for the New English dictionary.

Dr. Murray has, therefore, well defined his limit: "The present work aims at exhibiting the history and signification of the English words now in use, or known to have been in use since the middle of the *twelfth* century." "We exclude all words that had become obsolete by 1150. But to words actually included this date has no application; their history is exhibited from their first appearance, however early." I think all English scholars will concur with Dr. Murray that this is the proper limit from which to begin, for a dictionary of this character must exhibit the whole field of the Early English vocabulary as well as that of Modern English, and in the case of words that did not become obsolete until after 1150 it must exhibit their history from the earliest period. The Toller-Bosworth dictionary should include all English words in existence down to 1150, even though the last century of this period may be defined as Late Anglo-Saxon, and the two together will then form a complete Thesaurus of the English language.

The vocabulary is classified under (1) Main Words, (2) Subordinate Words, (3) Combinations, but the limits of this notice will permit only brief explanations, and the plan of the work can be readily seen from a cursory examination of one of the specimen pages which have been so widely distributed by the publishers.

The treatment of a Main Word comprises: I. Its identification, which includes the *main form* in its usual spelling, obsolete and non-naturalized words being distinguished by certain marks, the pronunciation, grammatical designation, specification, status, earlier forms, and inflexions. Here it deserves special notice that the *periods* of the language are distinguished by the final figure of the century, as follows: 1. Old English or Anglo-Saxon, to 1100; 2. Old English Transition; 3. Early Middle English; 4. Late Middle English; 5. Middle English Transition; 6. Early Modern English; 7. Middle Modern English; 8, 9. Current English. These are the periods proposed by Dr. Murray in his excellent article on the English language in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* (ninth edition), and there stated to have been first suggested by Mr. Sweet. As they have now been adopted in this dictionary, they should pass into general use and settle the much-discussed question of the chronological divisions of the English language. If a less minute analysis is desired, the terms Old English, or Anglo-Saxon (it matters not which is used), to 1150, Middle English, to 1400, and Modern English, since 1400, might be employed, each of which is susceptible of an Early and a Late division, obliterating the Transition periods.

II. The morphology, or form-history, including derivation, or etymology, subsequent form-history in English, and miscellaneous facts in relation to the

word. Here it deserves notice that "in this dictionary, words originally native are traced to their earliest known English, and, when possible, to their earliest Teutonic form, authenticated and illustrated by the cognate words in other Teutonic languages and dialects; those of foreign origin are referred to the foreign word or elements whence they were immediately adopted or formed. In certain cases these foreign words, especially the French, are themselves traced to their antecedent forms or component elements; but these antecedents are considered only with a view to the clearer comprehension of the history and use of the word in English. To trace the remoter history of these words, and determine their Aryan or other 'roots,' is no part of their English history."

Thus, Dr. Murray's plan differs from that of Prof. Skeat, as attempted in his *Etymological English Dictionary*, and for the better. Dr. Murray pertinently remarks, in a brief note, "As a rule, it may be assumed that the original form of every Middle English word of French origin was *identical* with the Anglo-French form; and that, where a gap appears between the earliest known English form of a word and its Old French equivalent, that gap would be filled up by the recovery of the Anglo-French and the earliest English form." Just here is the field to which English scholars of Old French should devote themselves, for the influence of Anglo-French upon English during the whole Middle English period has never yet been sufficiently investigated.

III. The signification—and doubtless the minute analysis and development of the different significations of a word, have constituted the most laborious part of the editor's duty. He says: "The order in which these senses were developed is one of the most important facts in the history of the word; to discover and exhibit it are among the most difficult duties of a dictionary which aims at giving this history"; and, further, "To a great extent the *explanations* of the meanings have been framed anew upon a study of all the quotations for each word collected for this work, of which those printed form only a small part. But the labors of other scholars in this, the most successfully cultivated department of English lexicography, have not been neglected." Dr. Johnson and Todd, as well as Bailey, are specially mentioned, but we miss any allusion to more modern lexicographers, who, one would have thought, had made some advance in this department of English lexicography. A brief comparison, however, with any other dictionary, as Webster, for example, under *Advertise* and *Advertisement*, will show the immense difference even in this particular, and the obsolete significations receive special attention from Dr. Murray.

IV. Quotations, in which consists the main strength of this work. When we reflect that 1300 readers of books, in all periods of English, have supplied over 3,500,000 quotations, and that the services of thirty sub-editors have been required to arrange and analyze this immense mass, we can get some idea of the labor expended upon the work. These quotations "are arranged chronologically, so as to give about one for each century, though various considerations often render a larger number necessary." Sometimes, however, we find a much greater difference than a century, as under some of the senses of *After* (cf. III 11, 1230 and 1697), but these omissions are not material. In all cases "the original spelling is retained, as an essential part of the history of the language," and a great help to ascertaining it.

The Subordinate Words include obsolete and variant forms, not readily referred to their original, irregular or peculiar inflexions, alleged words of doubtful formation or existence, and spurious or erroneous forms. Combinations include all collocations of simple words, whether connected by a hyphen or not.

Lastly, the Pronunciation is very carefully exhibited, it being regarded as "the actual living form or forms of a word, that is, *the word itself*, of which the current spelling is only a symbolization." "This living form is the *latest fact* in the form-history of the word, the starting-point of all investigations into its previous history, the only fact in its form-history to which the lexicographer can personally witness." On these principles, then, following the modern phonetic school, Dr. Murray makes a more exact analysis of pronunciation, particularly of the *vowel* sounds, than we are accustomed to find in the ordinary dictionaries. The consonants include *thirty-one* distinct sounds, and the vowels *fifty-nine* (besides *five* minute variations of certain sounds), classed as ordinary (short), long, and obscure. Some might take exception to certain statements, but with respect to pronunciation, more than anything else, is it true that "no one man's English is *all* English."

I have thus endeavored, as far as possible in Dr. Murray's own words, to give an idea of the aim and plan of this great dictionary. The editor may well be congratulated upon the manner in which this plan has been executed. To say that it far surpasses all other works is to pay but a poor tribute to its excellence. Its value from the historical point of view is inestimable, as it presents for the first time a continuous history of English words, ascertained by the strictest inductive process. It is not, however, a dictionary for the scholar only, but for the man of general culture also. While some might desire a larger number of modern examples, and in some cases from works of greater authority than those cited, the limits of the work must be taken into consideration. It may be doubted whether such words as *Absentaneous*, for which no example can be found, and which is given only on the authority of "Bailey, 1721, Ash, 1775, etc.," should be included, or whether any word should be included that is not sustained by a positive example from some English work. Possibly omissions may be found by those who search for them carefully, but they will be few.

Certainly earlier examples than any given of the use of certain words or phrases, or of words in special meanings, will be found. A few notes made in reading with a class the extracts in Morris and Skeat's *Specimens of Early English* enable me to add the following earlier examples: *Abash* is found in Robert of Brunne's *Handlyng Synne*, 5642 (c. 1303), "And was *abashed* as [a] mad." *Accord* occurs in the sense of *to be at accord* in *The Owl and Nightingale*, 181 (c. 1250), "*þe; we ne beon at one acorde*"; *Adventure* occurs in the phrase *on adventure* in Robert of Gloucester (*Morris*, Part II, 176, c. 1297), "*þat anaunter ȝif euermo keueringe þer-of is*." Moreover, if Maetzner is correct, *Amad* in *King Horn*, 574, is another form of *Amayed*, dismayed (from O. Fr. *esmaier*), and is not the same as *Amad*, distracted (from O. E. *gemæd*), as both *Stratmann* and *Wissmann* take it; the example does not occur in *Murray*. Such slight inconsistencies as assigning *King Alfred's Baeda* to 885 under *Abbatess* and to 880 under *Abbot*, and *King Horn* to 1270 under *Aby* and to

1300 under *Admiral*, scarcely deserve mention, and denote simply that different sub-editors have worked up these articles.

It is to be hoped that the succeeding parts of the work will not be long delayed, and that the editor will be supplied with all the editorial and clerical assistance necessary to enable him to prepare them as rapidly as is consistent with thoroughness and accuracy. It would be of service in the use of the dictionary if the list of works read, with their full titles and dates, should be published with the second part, and not delayed for several years until the work is completed. Besides the convenience of reference, any omissions of works that it might be desirable to read could be supplied. All English-speaking people may be congratulated on the prospect of possessing, in the course of time, a dictionary worthy to be ranked alongside of the great works of Grimm and Littré, and in some respects superior to them. Americans also will deserve a share in the credit due, for they, too, have furnished a large number of readers for this comprehensive work embracing the English vocabulary of over seven hundred years.

JAMES M. GARNETT.

Altfranzösische Bibliothek. Herausgegeben von Dr. WENDELIN FOERSTER. Achter Band, Orthographia Gallica, ältester Traktat über Französische Aussprache und Orthographie, nach vier Handschriften, zum ersten Mal herausgegeben von J. STÜRZINGER. Heilbronn, Verlag von Gebr. Henninger, 1884. xlv, 52 S.

A critical edition of the oldest known treatise on French pronunciation and orthography is here brought out in good time by an enthusiastic, hard-working Privat Docent of Bonn. His careful and thorough treatment of the Raetoromanische Conjugation (Winterthur, 1879), of the Sacrifice d'Abrahaam (Romania, 1881), and the publication of the London text of Girard de Rosillon (Boehmer's Romanische Studien), had already been sufficient to warrant the expectation that this number of the Altfranzösische Bibliothek would contain much of importance for the Romance scholar, and, in fact, for the present state of the problem touching the relation of written signs to their phonetic equivalents, this contribution cannot be too highly valued. The work in itself bears directly upon a limited field of sound notation, that is, the French; but in its constant reference to English, it becomes of scarcely less interest to the English scholar than to the specialist in the Neo-Latin idioms. In his introduction, the editor gives us a little more than twenty pages on the history of French grammar in England before the sixteenth century, which he follows up by about the same number, on a discussion of the MSS, according to which the Orthographia Gallica is here published.

The rest of the work is divided in two equal parts, where the former, the original treatise, is disposed into three parallel columns, by which arrangement the discrepancies and agreements of the several manuscripts are manifest at a glance, while the latter is separated into two sections that comprise nearly thirty-five pages of *variae lectiones* and notes.

The French language, in England, has been compared to an exotic plant which, transplanted into a foreign soil, developed for a time, then sickened

and died.¹ The period of its growth and final sway over the English may be put down from some time before the Norman conquest, to the loss of Normandy (1066-1204), or in round numbers for the eleventh and twelfth centuries, while the epoch of its struggle for life and ultimate uprooting from English soil, save in judicial proceedings, may be marked from the loss of Normandy to the end of the reign of Edward III (1204-1377), in other words, as covering the XIII and XIV centuries.

The *terminus ad quem* of the Anglo-Norman dialect, as such, is now generally conceded to be the middle of the fourteenth century,² and the "grete deth" (1349), according to an old chronicler, Trevisa, is made the turning point in the custom that had prevailed, up to that time, of teaching Latin through French, and of the general use of the same in the schools. He tells us: "This maner was myche yused tofore the first moreyn, and is siththe som dele ychaungide; . . . so that now, the zere of owre Lord a thousand thre hundred foure score and fyve, of the secunde King Rychard after the Conquest nyne, in alle the gramer scoles of England children leveth Frensh, and construeth and lerneth an Englisch."³ From this time (1384) forward, then, we should naturally expect to find treatises written for learning French as a foreign tongue, and, up to the publication of the work before us, three such have been discovered, and, together with two collections of phrases for conversation or *Mannieres de Language*, have been mentioned, or in part given to the public. Two out of these three works, the so-called London Document, belonging to the thirteenth century, published in 1840, by Th. Wright, in Haupt and Hoffmann's *Altdeutsche Blätter*, II 193-5,⁴ and Coyfurelly's *Tractatus Orthographie Gallicane*,⁵ published by Prof. Stengel in *Zeitschrift für Neufrauzsische Sprache und Literatur*, I 16-24, treat of the pronunciation and orthography only, while the third, Barton's *Donait Francois*,⁶ also adds the morphology.

La Maniere de Language, a manual of conversational phrases, was first published in 1873, as supplement to the *Revue Critique*, by Paul Meyer, according to the Harleian MS, and again, in 1879, this text was collated by Stengel with the Oxford (All Souls) MS.⁷ From this same MS the Marburg professor gives us another short hand-book of conversation, entitled: *Un petit livre pour enseigner les enfantz de leur entreparler comun Francois*.⁸ Besides these works, our present editor goes forward and mentions, in his preface, others of a like character that he has been able to discover in the London, Oxford and Cambridge libraries, and which he describes according as they

¹ Scheibner, *Ueber die Herrschaft der französischen Sprache in England, vom XI bis zum XIV Jahrhundert*. Annaberg, 1880 (Progr.), p. 23.

² Vising, *Etude sur le Dialecte Anglo-Normand du XIIe siècle*. Diss. Upsala, 1882, p. 8.

³ Craik, *Sketches of the History of Literature and Learning in England, from the Norman Conquest to the Accession of Elizabeth*. London, 1844. Vol. I, p. 184.

⁴ Diez, *Grammatik* 330⁸; Stürzinger, *Orth. Gal.* XXIV.

⁵ *Tractatus orthographie gallicane per M. T. Coyfurelly, canonicum, Aurelianum doctorem utriusque juris, de novo editus secundum modum et formam parisiis*.

⁶ *Donait francois pur briefement entroduyr les Anglois en la droit language du Paris et de pais la d'entour fait aus despenses de Johan Barton par plusieurs bons clerks du language avandite*. Cf. Stengel, *Die ältesten Anleitungsschriften zur Erlernung der französischen Sprache*; *Zeitschrift für neufranz. Sprache und Literatur*, I 25-40.

⁷ Stengel, *loco citato*, 1-10.

⁸ Stengel, *ibidem*, 10-15.

refer to pronunciation and orthography, to morphology and to syntax. Under the first heading, four numbers are added to our former stock; namely, a fourth MS of the London Document (three only were known up to the present time, viz. *T*, Tower Document, or London Document, as Diez calls it, Grammatik 330⁸, now in the Record Office; *H*, Harleian MS 4971, of the British Museum; *O*, Oxford, Magdalen College, MS 188) which he marks *C*, as belonging to the Cambridge University Library MS Ee 4. 20; a second MS, of Coyfurelly's *Tractatus* (Brit. Mus. Addit. 17716), a treatise composed of selections from the above-mentioned Cambridge MS of the London Document, and from Coyfurelly, and, lastly, from the British Museum, the Sloane MS 513, which contains some valuable remarks with reference to the formation of plurals.

Under the head of morphology, the young scholar has also been fortunate, having added, besides the MSS just mentioned, the Cambridge MSS Ee 4. 20 and Dd 12. 23, where some interesting facts touching the conjugation are to be found.

The other parts of speech, such as pronouns, numerals, particles, adverbs and conjunctions, are also found in these different documents, all of which represent the purely practical side of language; and, hence, for the Syntax also we should not expect to discover anywhere a scientific treatment, and especially so as no such had existed for the Latin before this time. Instead, therefore, of general rules bearing upon the word-construction, we meet here simple collections of examples, in accordance with which, as representative specimens, the learner is supposed to regulate his phrase-building.

For the manuals of conversation, the editor thinks the collection published by P. Meyer and E. Stengel, according to the Harleian and All Souls MSS above referred to, are probably the oldest that exist. These earlier dialogues are unaccompanied by an English translation, but we soon come down to a period where such help is necessary, and several interesting selections are given to illustrate the conversational style of the time as portrayed in formulae of greeting, in talks with merchants, in colloquies between guest and hotel-keeper, etc. These *Mannieres de Language* belong to the XIV and XV centuries, and often represent a state of the French which, in connection with the English, is of great importance to the philologist, as showing a correspondence of sentence tournure that is much closer than that of to-day.

As a résumé of where we stand at present, with reference to this class of literature, it may be stated that the early treatises on phonology and pronunciation exist in nine manuscripts, of which the *Orthographia Gallica* and Coyfurelly are the chief representatives; the morphology, principally presented in the conjugation, is treated in seven manuscripts; the declination, in particular, comes up in one only, the pronouns are found in three and the numerals in seven MSS, and two printed works.

The *Mannieres de Language* occur in five MSS and two printed works, while models for letter-writing exist in six manuscripts. These works were the school-books for this subject at the time they were written, and had principally for their authors the teachers of that epoch. They extend over more than two centuries, forming a continuous chain at the end of the fourteenth and beginning of the fifteenth centuries.

Contrary to the opinion expressed by several of the early chroniclers, that the study of French at this time was only a matter of fashion, our editor holds that it was rather the practical use of it which caused the production of methods for teaching it, and very appropriately observes that the caprices of mere fashion-seekers are not likely to continue thus uninterrupted through several centuries.

The *Orthographia Gallica* was written by an Englishman, between 1250 and 1350, in order to regulate, according to French models, the orthography of the Anglo-Norman, which had a strong tendency at that time to shape itself more and more after the popular pronunciation. The topics, therefore, that are naturally insisted upon most by the author are the differences between the Anglo-Norman pronunciation and that of the French proper, considered from an English point of view.

The editor, in accordance with this idea, divides the material of the work into three categories: (1) where differences between Anglo-Norman and French orthography are discussed; (2) where cases of varying French orthography are given; (3) where examples of only Latin orthography are touched upon, and general rules laid down for the same in original documents.

Two examples will suffice to illustrate the importance of this publication, with reference to the history of the graphic signs used to represent the same sound at different periods of the language.

Rule XII stands: *que vel qui consuevit olim scribi cum k, sed apud modernos commutatur k in q*, and, following up this canon, the editor shows that the author's "*olim*" must have been the beginning of the thirteenth century, the *Blüthezeit* of *ki* and *ke*, which first came into use after the middle of the twelfth century, and that after 1281 *qui que, qi qe* are almost exclusively found.

Rule XV prescribes that *gn* and not *ngn* should be written in *besoignes, signifiant* and their like, and in explanation of this change it is shown that the appearance of the triple combination belongs to the beginning of the thirteenth century, during which period, as well as during the following century, Anglo-Norman documents contain plenty of examples of it. It is found, furthermore, in the Latin of the late Empire period, and also in Dauphiné cartularies of the thirteenth century, but not in the oldest French manuscripts. Here the binary compound was the rule.

The notes are excellent and judiciously distributed, with so extensive bibliographical references that they often make the historical study of the different subjects covered by the phonetic rules easy, from the earliest published references to them down to the present time.

A. M. ELLIOTT.

Encyklopaedie und Methodologie der Romanischen Philologie, mit Besonderer Berücksichtigung des Französischen und Italienischen, von GUSTAV KÖRTING. Zweiter Theil: Die Encyklopaedie der Romanischen Gesammt-Philologie. Heilbronn, Henninger, 1884. xviii, 505 S.

We have here a portly octavo volume of over five hundred pages, following close upon Part I of the same work, noticed in No. 17 of this Journal. In the first issue the author confined himself to preliminary notions touching the

relation of language to thought, to the non-dependence of written sign on phonetic product, to the development and classification of speech-forms and the growth of literature, to the general conception of philology, with its extensive reach and divers limitations according to the nature of individual languages, and to broad characteristics of a methodology of the Romance languages. In the much more important work before us he confines himself to the Romance group, and divides the immense mass of material treated into two great categories; (1) that of a purely linguistic character; (2) the literary matter belonging to this department of philology as a whole. Under the first heading are classified all the general varying conditions of sound and word—the production, constitution, development, and assortment of the one; the formation, relations of the parts, and history of the other—to which is appropriately added a short supplement on characteristic phrase-building, style, and special Romance speech history.

Under the second division he ranges literary works, according to both their outer and inner history, their particular form, their sources, the mode of their interpretation (text-criticism and exegesis), and, finally, according to groupings, into distinct sets that belong to the domain of Romance literary expression only.

The purely philological part covers about two-thirds of the book, which the author originally proposed to accompany by a sort of annals of Romance philology. These were to contain a list of all the most important works on the language, arranged in chronological order, that have appeared in the several departments of this subject, and in addition, a system of biographical data touching the principal Romance scholars of to-day, the founding of professorships, of associations for neo-Latin studies, etc. After this material had been collected, however, the author found that it was too great in amount and varied in kind to be hung on to his already large volume, and he therefore promises us the whole of it at an early date, recast and developed into a "History of Romance Philology." While every scholar who is working in this field will be rejoiced to have the suggestion of such a history, it must be doubted whether, at this early stage in the growth of the subject, such an attempt may not be premature. Of course the writer would propose to confine himself, in great measure, to the French, since the materials for a survey of the remaining Neo-Latin idioms are not yet at hand. But, however incomplete such a review would seem for the non-gallic branches of the Romance stock, it would have the merit, at least, of showing what an extraordinary development the French domain has had within the last ten to fifteen years, and no one else, perhaps, is more capable of putting us *au courant* with all the different stages of growth which this young science has passed through, than the author of this, our first veritable encyclopaedia of Romance philology.

The second volume (Zweiter Theil) of this work is a model of comprehensive statement, of characterisation of detail, of clear, well-defined method, and shows a range of reading that must impress every one who is at all acquainted with the general run of it, as little less than wonderful. This is particularly true of the phonology and morphology, where the former will be of special interest to the student as a résumé of the most advanced ideas upon this subject, and as thus forming a sort of handbook, which may be taken for a reliable guide

in the puzzling complexity of material that is encountered in an introduction to this branch of linguistics.

The physiological basis of all voice-products is here stated with succinctness, and duly insisted upon as the keynote to any system of sound-study, and the reach of phonetic law is thus shown to depend upon the varying conditions of nature, where the unerring principle of "survival of the fittest" and of "least action" determine the final results.

For his treatment of the vowel-system, our author shows himself conservative and unwilling, as yet, to accept Boehmer's hypothesis,¹ with reference to the development in Romance of the Latin vowels, that is, it depends exclusively on the quality of the original vowel. Before the announcement of this theory, it was the quantity of the vowel that was considered the basis of change. Koerting, following ten Brink,² would make both quantity and quality essential conditions to Romance types, and he does not stand here, therefore, upon a plane of purely practical interchange of elements between the Latin and the modern idioms, such as we have it in Diez' Grammatik and in Scheler's *Lois Phonétiques*. When the former wrote his celebrated work on Romance grammar, such a thing as the science of phonology can scarcely be said to have existed, and hence we find this part of his work one of the specially weak points in it. Little or no attention was then paid to the physiological production of sound as the foundation upon which all correct principles rest in the differentiation of phonetic categories. Hence it was that a natural but false starting point was chosen from which the intricate and perplexing relations of Romance sounds were studied. Latin quantity was transferred to the Neo-Latin tongues, though they are essentially accent languages, and the growth of French phonetic products was conditioned by the double circumstance of quantity and position. The theory, therefore, of Boehmer was radical in its tendency and was considered epoch-making by some of the leading Romance scholars.³ Among those who have advocated the same, or slightly modified tenets, with reference to relation of quality and quantity in the Latin, we must note Schuchardt,⁴ of the University of Graz; Suchier,⁵ of Halle; Gaston Paris,⁶ of the Collège de France; who maintain that vowels do not undergo changes according to their quantity exclusively, but according to their sound, in other words, that the quality of Romance vowels is independent, in great measure at least, of the quantity of their Latin prototypes; and that the long vowel of the Latin metre represented a closed sound, while the short one was open, as, for example, is evidenced in the discrimination of the present from the perfect in such forms as *venit (apertum)*, *venit (clausum)*; furthermore, that the quantity of the Latin vowels was not a stable factor, and hence, for this very reason, they could not have had any constant influence on the development of the Romance vowels. These views are shared by the author of our *Encyklopaedie* in so far only as they bear upon the quality of the long and short vowels, that is, length was invariably bound up with the clausum, and shortness with the

¹ Klang, nicht Dauer, *Romanische Studien*, III 351-66 et 609-16.

² Klang und Dauer, Strassburg, 1879.

³ Groeber, *Zeitschrift für Romanische Philologie*, III 146-8.

⁴ Vokalismus des Vulgärlateins, I 471, et *Zeitschrift für Romanische Philologie*, IV 140.

⁵ *Zeitschr. f. Rom. Phil.* III 135.

⁶ *Romania*, X 39.

apertum, but he is distinctly separated from his colleagues, when he holds for the Latin that, with a given difference of quantity, there was always united a certain difference of quality. For the question, however, as to which of these elements predominated in the production and coloring of the Romance vowel, it is impossible to determine, from the simple fact that the two conditions of length and shortness, shutness and openness, are never found separated, nor can the one be eliminated without destroying the other.

For the morphology we find here less innovation upon the works of his predecessors than in the phonology. The principal reason for this lies in the condition of the subject itself as a theme for modern treatment. Diez was not strong at the ends of his line of grammatical investigation, that is, in phonology and syntax, but in morphology he not only holds his own, but continues to offer the best representation of the entire system that has ever been given us, in face of the rapid advance in the treatment of special topics.

In entering upon this division of his subject, the author is careful to insist upon what he considers the legitimate province of an Encyclopaedia, namely, it is to give a general view of the flexions according to the light of recent investigation, and not to discuss the probability of divers theories with reference to special, technical questions. Contrary to general custom, but in accordance with the logical order of grammar categories, he then begins by placing the article in its natural word-class, the demonstrative pronouns, and after a clear statement of the principle which underlies a scientific arrangement of the Latin declination he goes forward to show why the accusative in particular was taken as the typical form for a vast majority of the Romance substantives, especially in the singular, while in the plural the Eastern group (Italian and Wallachian) draws its characteristics from the Latin nominative, and the remaining languages (Spanish, Portuguese, Mod. French, Mod. Provençal, and Raetian) stick to the traditions of the singular accusative. This generalisation, of course, does not cover the Old French and Old Provençal, which had their system of declination developed regularly out of the Latin both with and without change of accent.

For the verb, it is the flexions that offer the greatest deviation from the old system and show better than anything else the progress made in tracing the original types that produced them. That the modern forms should have become complex and difficult to trace is thought no wonder, when we bear in mind that not a single verb in the whole domain of Romance speech has built all its parts according to one and the same conjugational type. The A-conjugation has been preserved with the greatest fidelity, but even here we frequently find a mixing with other conjugations, as, for example, in Italian *amiamo*, produced by analogy with the I-conj. *sentiamo*, which, again, in its turn has the flexional *a* of the A-conj. So, too, the French *aimons* probably does not = *amamus*, which would have produced **aimains* (cf. *les mains* = *manus*), but comes from a type **amimus*, or, in other words, is an analogical creation according to the strong form *sumus*. Whatever opinion may be held with reference to these special types, we cannot derive the imperfect *aimais* from *amabam*, but from **amēbam*, that is, it follows the analogy of *punissais* = **puniscēbam*, and this again must be referred to *sentais* = **sentēbam*, for *sentiebam*.

From these few examples it will be readily seen what a thorough scientific

discipline has been able to do for us in the treatment of this most complicated grammar category, and if such difficulties arise for the so-called regular verbs, how much more intricate do the conditions become for the irregular verb system.

Here, however, to simplify matters, we have no full strong conjugation, in the strict sense of the term, but only strong flexional forms in certain tenses.

In a statement of the scope of phrase-building and the relation of syntax to logic, the author traces the main characteristics of the Neo-Latin sentence, and adds some valuable remarks on the history of Romance syntax, which he divides into two periods, namely: (1) that before the influence of the Classic Latin models was felt upon the literary form, and (2) after the educated writers began to imitate the Latin style. Here we find a stricter, more logical construction, with a high development often of the rhetorical element, while in the former a great liberty of phrase-setting is maintained, that enables the writer to pass easily from one mode of construction to another according as it suited his thought.

For the second part of this volume the author reviews the various systems of sound notation that have been proposed in Romance, especially those of Boehmer, Ascoli and Trautmann, then sketches the history of the earliest editions of the older literature, and lays down the canons in accordance with which a sound text criticism must be carried out, and finally considers briefly the various literary forms that have been used in the Neo-Latin idioms from the earliest periods down to the present time.

One of the most important features of this valuable work is the abundant bibliographical notices that accompany almost every section of it. With these and with the lucid exposition of theory and principle, the neat tracings of history and literary form, with the bold outlining of the subject as a whole, the young worker in Romance languages may trust himself to his enthusiasm in the assurance that, if he follows the method here laid down, he will in time attain rich results. The book cannot be too highly recommended, especially to those in the early stages of their work.

A. M. ELLIOTT.

Ueber tragische Schuld und Sühne. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Aesthetik des Dramas. Von Dr. JULIUS GOEBEL. Berlin, 1884.

It seems not unfitting that this conservative and able essay, on the history and theory of the modern German drama, should have been written by a German-American, full of the German ideal, and inclined to believe that it will determine the future of all the nations of Teutonic race.

The strangely checkered history of this highest branch of composition in Germany is, in its darker portions, the history of an unwise and uncentred cosmopolitanism. We are prepared to find the theory of an objective critic like Otto Ludwig culminating in the sentence: "Alles Wesentliche in der tragischen Composition lässt sich schon in einem detaillirten, gründlichen Vergleiche der antiken und der Shakespeare'schen Tragödie entwickeln und darstellen"; for he rightly claims Shakespeare as a part of the common Germanic inheritance. We are even prepared to find the same critic, with

others, rating Schiller's theory of dramatic composition somewhat low; for few persons of Anglo-Saxon race, nourished on Shakespeare, could help feeling that there is, occasionally, something wrong in Schiller's conception of the tragical character; even though they should know little of the struggles of the master, under the incubus of the "Schicksalsidee."

The above instances are weak indeed, compared with the real cosmopolitan and negative tendencies in the German drama; and these it is hard for a non-German to account and allow for.

Dr. Goebel has carefully and candidly considered these tendencies, and emphatically re-affirms the cardinal importance of the doctrine of a "tragische Sühne" as a corrective for them in the modern drama. To support this, he has made a historical analysis of "tragische Schuld und Sühne," as seen in the works and utterances of Lessing, the Stürmer und Dränger, Herder, Goethe, and Schiller, and has given, further, a history of the term in the writings of the aestheticists: Solger, Hegel, Vischer, etc. The book is distinctly philosophical and theoretical, but the treatment is, throughout, literary, and the examples are happily chosen from a wide field. As might be expected, Lessing and Schiller come hardly off in the historical analysis, and Goethe is rightly held to have reached the highest point, among the Germans, in the development of tragic guilt in the drama, in the character of Egmont and Gretchen. Iphigenia is happily called "die künstliche Ueberwindung eines erstorbenen Kunstprinzips." Shakespeare is supreme; but even he has not always so arranged the close of his dramas as to stand the test of the doctrine of tragical expiation (p. 100).

The author concludes that there is, as yet, no "eigentlich deutscher Stil" in the drama (p. 99), and further, "Der Zukunft bleibt es aufbehalten, unabhängig von der Antike und Shakespeare, und doch mit Aufnahme ihrer lebensfähigen Elemente diesen Stil auszubilden."

His position in general, towards the present state of the drama, is most concisely stated in the preface. "Es dünkte mir, als nütze die gegenwärtige Dichter-generation die Schätze nicht, welche die Forschung zu Tage gefördert. . . . Mir war als habe noch keiner unser wichtiges dramatisches Gesetz im Geiste germanischer Weltanschauung erfasst und benutzt." His remedy is that dramatic art should work towards a view of life shared by the whole people, and one which the nation has waited and longed for.

It is to be hoped that the now feverishly active German mind is nearer such a consummation than appears to be the case with the English, which has been waiting, almost without hope, ever since it was plunged into the bathos of the Restoration drama.

H. W.

REPORTS.

ANGLIA. Herausgegeben von R. P. WÜLCKER und M. TRAUTMANN. VI
Band, 3 u. 4 Hefte. Halle, 1883.

VI 3.

P. Lefèvre begins this number with a long article on The Old English [Anglo-Saxon] Poem of Saint Guthlac, another contribution to the Cynewulf question. After a brief résumé of the preceding articles on this question, which are already known to the readers of this Journal, he investigates the authorship of the Guthlac by comparing it with the Riddles 1-60, Juliana, Christ, Elene, Vision of the Cross, and Phoenix, regarded as genuine works of Cynewulf, and with the Riddles 61-89, Andreas, and Descent into Hell, regarded as probable works of Cynewulf, the first place, however, being given to the universally acknowledged Juliana, Christ, and Elene. The investigation proceeds from a study of the metre, vocabulary and phraseology, characteristic passages, and composition and relation to its source, which is, from verse 501, the Latin Life of St. Guthlac, by Felix of Croyland. Rieger had assumed two divisions of the poem, 1-790, and 791 to the end, and this division had been accepted by Charitius in his article on the Guthlac (Anglia II), but Lefèvre prefers to make three divisions, 1-500, 501-790, and 791 to the end. After a very full investigation, from the points of view above mentioned, and a careful analysis of each of the three parts of the poem, Lefèvre comes to the conclusion that the three parts of the poem are the work of *one* author, thus differing from Charitius, who had regarded the third part alone as by Cynewulf (791 to end). Lefèvre considers the third part as distinguished from the others by greater perfection of form, but thinks that this proves only that it was written later than the others, and that Dietrich's date for the composition of the poem (760 A. D.) is too late for the first and second parts (1-790), which together form a connected whole. An appendix to the article contains a full conspectus of the *rime* in Cynewulf, as it appears in all of the above-mentioned poems.

A. Ebert compares briefly the Anglo-Saxon Physiologus with two Latin Physiologi in Berne MSS (B and C) of the ninth century, in the first of which the same animals occur, and in the same order, as in the single Anglo-Saxon MS, namely, the Panther, the Whale, and the Bird, called by Grein the Partridge. It appears from the comparison that the Anglo-Saxon Physiologus is but a fragment of the much fuller Latin Physiologus, the Panther being the twenty-third animal, and seven others following it, in MS B.

F. Groschopp treats the Anglo-Saxon poem 'Christ and Satan,' being the second book of the so-called poems of Caedmon. After a brief notice of the MS and of the editions of Junius, Thorpe, Bouterwek, and Grein, he considers the poem from both a literary and a grammatical standpoint. Ten

Brink's division into three independent poems (1-365, 366-664, and 665-733) is not approved, but Groschopp thinks a connection runs through the three parts of the poem, and that they may be regarded as the fragments of a single larger poem which a restorer, by certain additions, has attempted to unite again into one whole. After a synopsis of the contents of each part of the poem, he cites the expressions common to each part, and notwithstanding the lyrical tone of the first part as compared with the more epical tone of the second, he infers, from the agreement in vocabulary and style, and in poetical treatment of the subjects, that they form *one* poem, and that it is not impossible that it is one of Caedmon's poems, though it stands in no relation to Genesis, Exodus and Daniel. The examination of the grammar, both phonology and inflection, shows that, while the poem is written in the West-Saxon dialect, the irregularities point to the Kentish dialect, the copyist being probably from Kent.

J. L. Cheney, writing in English, investigates The Sources of Tindale's New Testament. He first states the views that have been held on the subject, though it would scarcely seem necessary to notice the erroneous and antiquated view of Hallam, or even those of Froude and Green, alongside of that of such a textual critic as the late Dr. Tregelles. Cheney uses in his collation the first edition of Tindale, printed at Worms, 1526, along with the chapters of Matthew printed at Cologne, 1525, the first portion of the New Testament ever printed in English, indicating also the variations of the edition of 1534 and of that of 1534-35 (G. H.) The Greek text of Erasmus's *third* edition, and his Latin version, along with the Vulgate text as given in his *fourth* edition, are used, but Cheney omits to give the dates of the different editions of Erasmus. The Luther version used is that of Sept. 1522, and that of Dec. 1522. The Wiclif text used is that of Forshall and Madden, Oxford, 1850, but no distinction is made between the earlier and later versions, Wiclif and Purvey. Cheney has compared St. Matthew 2-7, Romans 1-6, Galatians, Titus, Philemon, Revelation 1-6, and the Epistles of St. John, thirty-five chapters in all, of which only St. Matthew 2-7, and Galatians, twelve chapters (328 passages), are printed in Anglia. The general conclusion is "that Tindale's Testaments show traces of the influence of the four versions," inconsiderable as regards Wiclif and the Vulgate, and much greater as regards Erasmus than Luther, and of Erasmus the Latin, as well as the Greek, was followed, and the Latin, at times, preferred. Dr. Tregelles, however, had said: "That Tyndale's translation was made from the Greek, no one can question"; and "further, the translation was made from the Greek and not the Latin of Erasmus." It seems to me that Cheney has added "Erasmus Latin" after certain passages, where Tyndale's English is as accurate a translation of the Greek as of the Latin, *e. g.*, "Galatians V 19, aduoutrie, *Er. μοιχεία*, adulterium." The article is, however, another testimony to the independence of Tyndale, and a suitable tribute to the memory of the great translator and martyr. Cheney rightly says: "The Revised Version of 1881, it is interesting to note, returns in several cases to the translation made by Tindale, but altered by later revisions." It is to be hoped that some scholar will investigate all the passages in which this has been done, and thus accumulate evidence as to how much we are indebted to Tyndale for our present English Bible.

F. Voges discusses at length The Reflexive Dative in English, and supplies, to my mind, the weightiest article in this number. He briefly mentions a few English grammars, from Hickes to Earle, which notice this well-marked locution either very cursorily or not at all. He then separates "the *pleonastic* dative" into two strongly distinguished classes: 1. The so-called *ethical* dative, as in "One Colonna cuts *me* the throat of Orsini's baker," (Bulwer, *Rienzi* I 3), and so frequent in Shakspeare. 2. The *reflexive* dative, as in "Hie *thee* on thy steed" (*ib.* IV 2). The first is unquestionably a dative, but in the second class this is often very uncertain. Maetzner and Fiedler-Sachs mingle the two classes, and Koch mentions the *ethical* dative very briefly. Voges well remarks that the term "pleonastic" applied to both cases must be taken *cum grano salis*, for while the pronoun may be omitted without injuring the construction, it is never used without a purpose. The use of this *reflexive* dative has much diminished in the course of time: it was originally used chiefly with intransitive verbs, but the usage was early extended to transitive verbs. It is similar to the *ethical* dative, but there are important differences, the most noticeable of which is that in the *reflexive* dative the pronoun must be of like person, gender and number with the subject, while in the *ethical* dative it is generally different. After further discussion of the idiom, Voges notes two kinds of reflexive use of the pronoun: 1, with transitive verbs, always in the accusative, and 2, with intransitive verbs, generally in the dative. The different forms of the personal pronouns in Old English (Anglo-Saxon), Middle English, and Modern English, are next commented on, and then follows the bulk of the article, consisting of lists of verbs which are construed with the *reflexive* dative, with numerous examples from each of the three periods of the language, divided into the four classes, verbs of rest, of bodily movement, of mental emotions, and lastly, all those which cannot be brought under any one of these classes. The first class contains eight verbs, the second twenty-five, the third six, and the fourth eighty, including transitive and intransitive verbs, and those of Anglo-Saxon, Old Norse and Old French origin, forming forty-two pages of examples from the earliest times to the present. Only by such historical studies of English idioms can the grammar of the language ever be explained, but English scholars seem to leave it to Germans to make them.

K. Borchard has a long article on the History of the Text of Thomson's Seasons, considered in three sections, The Seasons before 1730, from 1730 to 1746, and since 1746. The first section notices briefly Thomson's literary activity to the publication of the first complete edition of The Seasons in 1730. The second section discusses at length the other editions published during Thomson's life, those of 1738, 1744, and 1746, noticing especially the numerous grammatical, stylistic and metrical changes made by Thomson between 1738 and 1744, as well as the additions, omissions and re-arrangements. The writer agrees with Cunningham (in *Athenaeum*, 1847) as against Mitford (in *Gentleman's Magazine*, 1841), that "the numerous emendations and alterations" made in a "small and beautiful writing" in Mitford's copy of the edition of 1738 were made by Lord Lyttelton and not by Pope. Some changes were also made by Thomson between 1744 and 1746, but they were not near so numerous or important as the preceding. The third section notices briefly the leading editions since 1746, especially those of Lord Lyttelton (1750), Murdoch (1762),

and Sir Harris Nicolas, the Aldine edition (1830, 1845, 1847), re-edited by Cunningham (1860). The section closes with a table showing the variations in number of lines of each poem in the principal editions.

G. E. MacLean presents a dissertation in English on Aelfric's Version of Alcuin's *Interrogationes Sigewulfi* in *Genesis*, most probably a doctor's dissertation. The brief general introduction treats the authors and their works, showing that the Abbot Aelfric (c. 1000 A. D.) translated into Anglo-Saxon a portion of Alcuin's "Handbook upon Genesis," written in answer to certain questions on that book, propounded by his pupil Sigewulf. Aelfric abridged the 280 questions and answers of Alcuin to 69. The critical introduction discusses at length the A. S. text and its MSS, of which there are *five*, one having heretofore been counted twice, the so-called C¹ belonging really to Codex C, as MacLean has shown. These MSS are each carefully described and compared, as well as the Latin MS, and Bouterwek's printed copy of MS M, the oldest MS, of which MS c is but a copy. The textual comparison notes "the possible intentional alterations, the probable clerical variations, and the phonological variations," with a careful summary of the last, showing that, while all the MSS are clearly Late West Saxon, M is the purest, B next, and C next, with a few earlier forms and perhaps a slight trace of Mercian influence. MS b has a Mercian coloring, though this may mark only the transition period, and c is merely a copy of M, with several late forms. The Creed and Doxology, appended to the work in MSS C and b, are regarded by MacLean as authentic. The authorship of the work is next discussed, and the conclusion reached, from opinions of critics, external and internal evidence, style and subject, that the work was written by Aelfric and no one else. His sources were Alcuin and Bede, with traces of Gregory the Great and Isidore. The A. S. text, with notes, will follow in a subsequent number.¹

This number closes with an explanatory note of thanks to Prof. Sievers by J. Platt; an exhortation of Mr. J. Platt by H. Sweet, for having made use of the latter's unpublished 'Oldest Texts' in his article 'Angelsaechsisches' (*Anglia* VI 1), when he had it only to make extracts for the Philological Society's English Dictionary; and a note by R. Wülcker, to the effect that in his review of Furnivall's *Digby Mysteries* (*Anglia* VI 2) he had overlooked the fact that two of them were already printed in *Reliquiae Antiquae* II, though not so accurately as in Furnivall's edition.

VI 4.

This number of the *Anzeiger* begins with a full bibliography of the books and essays in English philology which have appeared during the years 1880, 1881, and 1882, by F. Lüns. Reviews follow, and then short original essays, as the *Anzeiger* will, in future, contain such essays, the longer ones being reserved for the principal numbers. The contents of this number are as follows:

L. Morsbach reviews F. J. Furnivall's *Fifty Earliest English Wills in the Court of Probate*, London, A. D. 1387-1439, with a *Priest's* of 1454, E. E. T. Society, 1882; J. Koch, *Chaucer Society Publications*, First Series LXIII and LXIV, being a Parallel-Text Print of Chaucer's *Troilus* and *Criseyde*, Parts I

¹ It has been printed in *Anglia* VII 1.

and II, 1881-2; also Max Lange's Untersuchungen über Chaucer's Boke of the Duchesse, Halle, 1883; and R. Merbot's Aesthetische Studien zur angelsächsischen Poesie, Breslau, 1883. M. Trautmann very briefly notices G. Tanger's school-edition of Christmas from W. Irving's Sketch-Book, Leipzig, 1883; E. Holthaus reviews W. W. Skeat's Aelfric's Lives of Saints, Part I, E. E. T. Society, 1881; and J. Schipper, Miss L. T. Smith's edition of Gorboduc, in Englische Sprach- und Literaturdenkmale des 16, 17 und 18 Jahrhunderts, Heilbronn, 1883; and J. M. Garnett's Translation of Beowulf: Boston, Ginn, Heath & Co., 1882.

Under Verschiedenes come four short essays: G. Tanger, Collation des Pariser Altenglischen Psalters mit Thorpe's Ausgabe; R. Wülcker, Über Bulwer's Jugendwerke, I: Bulwer's Weeds and Wildflowers; L. Morsbach, Zu Byron's Prisoner of Chillon; and M. Trautmann, Cynewulf und die Rätsel, in which he contends against the heretofore almost universally acknowledged Cynewulfian authorship of the Riddles, if not of all, at least of a part. Trautmann thinks that the friends of this view must bring better proofs than they have heretofore brought, and especially must show a more complete agreement "in sprachlichen dingen" between the Riddles and the undoubted poems of Cynewulf than Dietrich has shown in Z. für D. A., XII 246-47, and must compare the verse also. He adds: "So weit ich bis jetzt die rätsel mit den sicheren dichtungen Cynewulf's in sprachlicher und metrischer hinsicht zusammengehalten habe, ist freilich so gut wie kein grund vorhanden, ihm die rätsel in ihrer gesamtheit oder auch nur zu einem beträchtlichen theile zuzusprechen." The three groups of Riddles in the Codex Exonensis are regarded as originally *one* collection, consisting possibly of a hundred riddles.

JAMES M. GARNETT.

MNEMOSYNE, Vol. XI, Pt. 2.

The first article in this part, pp. 113-21, contains the continuation of van Herwerden's notes on Apollonius Rhodius. There is hardly anything in them which it is worth while to record here as being of general interest. On iii 773, where Medea wishes she had died *πρὶν Ἀχαιίδα γαῖαν ἰκέσθαι* | *Χαλκίωπης νίας*, H. remarks that "Phrivi filii, de quibus hic sermo est, susceperant quidem iter in Graeciam, sed incidentes in Argonautas nondum longè progressi cum his in Aeneam reverterant, neque igitur Ἀχαιίδα γαῖαν ἰκόντο." He therefore proposes to read *ἰέσθαι*, "in Graeciam tenderent," as in Homer we have *ἰέσθαι* used with *οἰκάδε, ἐρεβόδε*, etc. It is not necessary, he thinks, in this poet to make the further change Ἀχαιίδ' *ἐς αἶαν*, "quia nudus Accusativus a poetis saepissime conjungitur verbis eundi. Homerus sane posuisset Genetivum, sed quominus Apollonius eius exemplum sequeretur obstabant numeri." In iii 947 and iv 1591, *σχεδόν* is used in the sense of *statim*, "ut alibi *αὐτοσχεδόν* et *παρασχεδόν* usurpare assolet. Moneo propter lexicorum conditores, qui hanc vocabuli potestatem non commemorarunt." On iv 50, *οὐ γὰρ αἰδρις* | *ἦεν ὀδῶν*, H. is reminded of Eur. Hel. 1041, where he proposes to read *ὀδῶν ἀπειροι* in place of the meaningless *πεδίων*. The preceding line begins with *πείσαιμι*. "Librarius, ni fallor, errore scribere coeperat vocabuli, quod praegressum versum orditur, primas litteras ΠΕ, unde nata erat portentosa lectio *πεοδων*, quae deinde infelici coniectura in *πεδίων* reficta est."

We have next, pp. 122-60, the continuation of Cobet's notes on Stein's Herodotus. On ii 2 he commends Stein for adopting from the Vat. MS ἐπαγινέειν for ἐπάγειν. "Quis serio credet ἐπαγινέειν pro ἐπάγειν e Graeculi coniectura esse natum? Profecto non Steinius, qui antiquam formam optimo iure recepit in textum." On ii 3, where we are told, with regard to the experiment of Psammetichus as to the primitive language, that Ἕλληνες λέγονσι ἄλλα μάταια πολλά, and that the king put them in charge of women τὰς γλώσσας ἐκταμών, he writes: "quis credat Graecos sermones in patria inter se caedere de Psammeticho et vetustis Aegyptiorum fabulis? Dicuntur haec et similia de iis qui ante Herodotum historiam scripserunt et imprimis de Hecataeo Milesio." So on ii 15 εἰ βουλόμεθα γνώμῃσι τῆσι Ἰώνων χρᾶσθαι he explains: "id est si Hecataei Milesii auctoritatem sequi volumus, eleganter dictum pro: si quid Hecataeo credimus, quem deinde acute refutat et tantum non deridet." On the same chapter, ii 3, he writes Ἡλίου πόλιν but Ἡλιοπολίται: for "constantissime veteres omnes in talibus nomen urbis scribebant κατὰ παράθεσιν, Νέα πόλις, Μεγάλη πόλις (et sic Ἄρειος πάγος, ἀνὴρ ἀγαθός), sed civium nomen κατὰ σύνθεσιν, Νεοπολίτης, Μεγαλοπολίτης (Ἀρεοπαγίτης, ἀνδραγαθία)." In ii 25 the editors "mordicus retinent," the reading νετώτατοι, though Schweighauser divined the true νετιώτεροι which is found in A: "mirificum est commentum Lobeckii a Dindorfio laudatum: 'mihi substantiva νετός, ἐμετος, κάπετος, etc., adiectivorum ad naturam tam prope accedere videntur ut comparativos non admodum mirer.' Haud vidi magis. Stein quoque barbarum νετώτατοι fideliter servavit. Ὑετός, ἐμετος, etc., non magis adiectiva sunt quam πυρετός, σκελετός, ὄχετός, νιφετός, κοπετός, ἀροτος (ἀρούνη), ἀμητος (ἀμὴν), θάνατος, κάματος, et similia." In ii 39 Stein retains πυρὴν καίονσι, instead of adopting Bekker's correction of πῦρ ἀνακαίονσι, which occurs in i 132, viii 19. "Manifestum tenemus correctorem, qui quum haberet ob oculos ΠΥΡΑΝΑ-καίονσι sibi videre visus est πυρὰν καίονσι et Ionicum πυρὴν de suo dedit." On ii 69 where Stein gives ἀποθανόντας (τοὺς κροκοδείλους) θάπτουσι ταριχεύΟΝτες ἐν ἱρῇσι θήκησι, the reading of the Vat. ταριχεύΣΑΝτες should be adopted, "quia non poterant simul mortuos condire et sepelire. Sexcenties participia praesentis et praeteriti temporis sic temere inter se confunduntur. Non est tamen unquam anceps optio. Ex ipsa rei natura dicitur γελῶν ἀπῆλθε, quia simul ridebat et abibat, sed γελάσας εἶπε, quia nemo simul ridere et loqui potest." The passage, in which Hdt. confesses that he saw no more of the phoenix than its picture, is quoted, and Cobet remarks—not exactly in the tone of Prof. Sayce on the same chapter—"agnoscimus in his Herodoti candorem et veri amorem—omnino satius est sacerdotibus (in Aegypto quidem) nihil credere"; and the same chapter gives another occasion for changing the pres. into the aor. partic., "non poterat phoenix simul τὸν πατέρα σμύρνην ἐμπλάσσειν καὶ κομίζειν." On ii 147, where Stein has ἐστήσαντο δνῶδεκα βασιλῆας ἐς δνῶδεκα μοίρας δασάμενοι Αἰγυπτον πᾶσαν, he writes: "veteres et probati scriptores verbis dividendi et partiendi non addunt praepositionem. Itaque in partes duodecim dividerunt Aegyptum Graece sonat: δνῶδεκα μοίρας ἐδάσαντο Αἰγυπτον πᾶσαν, cf. vii 121: τρεῖς μοίρας ὁ Ξέρξης δασάμενος ἅπαντα τὸν περὶ τὸν στρατόν. Sic libri omnes." In ii 162 we have: κατελάμβανε τοὺς Αἰγυπτίους, ταῦτα μὴ ποιεῖν λέγοντος αὐτοῦ τῶν τις Αἰγυπτίων . . . περιέθηκε οἱ κνέην. "Male divisa haec sunt. Herodotus coniunxerat κατελάμβανε ταῦτα μὴ ποιεῖν. Namque

καταλαμβάνειν τινά est *abire* aut *progredi* *volentem* retinere. Amasis *dehortabatur Aegyptios ne id facerent, et dum verba fecit unus capiti eius coronam imponit.* Quia *κατελάμβανε* idem est quod *ἀπηγόρευε*, propterea quemadmodum dicitur *ἀπηγόρευε μὴ ποιεῖν*, sic hoc loco *κατελάμβανε ταῦτα μὴ ποιεῖν.*" This greatly improves the structure; but one would like to see another example of this use of *καταλαμβάνειν*.

At the end of his notes on this book, Cobet again maintains the veracity of Herodotus against his slanderers. He quotes a passage in which Strabo mocks him in regard to the account, in ii 28, of the sources of the Nile. "Comparato loco Herodoti, unde haec sumta sunt, Straboni, sat scio, subirasceris. Nihil enim huiusmodi pro veris Herodotus narrat sed audivisse se dicit ea in urbe Sai a quaeSTORE pecuniae sacrae, οὗτος δ' ἐμοιγε παίζειν ἐδόκεε, inquit. Nihilo magis credebatur τῆς πηγῆς τοῦ Νείλου εἶναι ἀβύσσους. Prudenter Herodotus: *si quidem*, inquit, haec vera narrabat, εἰ δ' ἄρα ταῦτα γενόμενα ἔλεγε, suspicor illo loco fuisse δινὰς τινὰς ἰσχυρὰς καὶ παλιρροίην, ὥστε μὴ δύνασθαι κατιεμένην καταπειρητηρίην ἐς βύσσον ἵεναι. Potuitne Strabo melius quam his refutari? Neque Strabo neque ceteri Herodoti reprehensores recordati sunt eorum quae historiae parens scripsit ii 123: τοῖσι μὲν νῦν ὑπ' Αἰγυπτίων λεγομένοισι χράσθω ὅτε τὰ τοιαῦτα πῦθάν ἐστι, ἐμοὶ ΔΕ παρὰ πάντα τὸν λόγον ὑποκέεται ὅτι τὰ λεγόμενα ὑπ' ἐκάστων ἀκοῇ γράφω.

The next article, pp. 161-89, is by Naber, entitled "De Aristophanis Nubibus." He begins by saying: "saepe mirari soleo in plerisque Aristophanis fabulis, in Vespis, in Nubibus, in Pluto, in Ranis, in Pace, qui factum sit, ut compositio tam sit imperfecta; singulae partes eximia arte expolitae sunt et summo poeta dignissimae; sed ἡ τῶν ὅλων σύστασις incredibiliter claudicat." The reason is not, as he thinks, that Wolf was right in his dictum "sero Graecos in poesi didicisse *totum ponere*,"—"equidem nunquam adducar ut credam, bonum poetam, qualem Aristophanem fuisse novimus, non meliorem exitum fabulae invenire potuisse, quam eum qui perabsurde in Vespis pro clausula est." But though Wolf only hinted at the difficulty without solving it, his disciple Boeckh discussed the integrity of the extant tragedies with admirable insight, "sed Aristophanem et Comoediam Graecam non complexus est. Huius igitur vestigiis insistentes, age exploremus num ea quae supersunt et genuina omnia sint et forma primitiva servata; sed ut tandem pervenire possimus eo quo tendimus, primum explicandum est quid sit fabulam *retractare* vel *διασκενάζειν*." To explain this, among other passages, this of Galen is quoted: "ἐπιδιεσκενάζεσθαι λέγεται βιβλίον ἐπὶ τῷ προτέρῳ γεγραμμένῳ τὸ δεύτερον γραφέν, ὅταν τὴν ὑπόθεσιν ἔχον τὴν αὐτὴν καὶ τὰς πλείστας τῶν ῥήσεων τὰς αὐτάς, τινὰ μὲν ἀφηρημένα ἐκ τοῦ προτέρου γράμματος ἔχει, τινὰ δὲ προσκείμενα, τινὰ δὲ ὑπὸ πλάγμειν, παράδειγμα δ' εἰ βούλει τοῦτον σαφηνείας ἐνεκα τὸν δεύτερον Αὐτόλυκον Εὐπόλιδος ἔχεις ἐκ τοῦ προτέρου διεσκενασμένον." A better example for us will be the Nubes, with regard to which N. expects to show that "superest hodie . . . prior editio, cui ex altera editione quaedam non nimis apte assuta sunt." The beginning even of this demonstration is not forthcoming in the present article, which, it must be confessed, is of a somewhat rambling character, and does not consent to be epitomized; though there are a good many interesting matters touched upon in it, of which some may be quoted. "Plurimum interest inter *διασκενῆν* et *διόρθωσιν*, nam ὁ *διασκεναστής* ipsum

librum retractat et corrigendo argumentum aliquatenus diversum facit, ὁ διορθωτῆς autem leviora menda procurat ut sententiae lenius decurrant et bellum gerit adversus librariorum negligentiam. Si quis suum ipse librum διορθοῖ, minuta et pusilla emendat, sed ὁ διασκευαστῆς hoc agit, ut fere novus liber exeat." There is evidence that, occasionally, poets wrote not what they thought best, but what would suit particular actors, as Aristotle tells us that certain plays contain ἐπεισόδια which succeed one another without necessity or probability. Such dramas are composed "ὑπὸ μὲν φάβλων ποιητῶν δι' αὐτοὺς, ὑπὸ δὲ τῶν ἀγαθῶν διὰ τοὺς ὑποκριτὰς· ἀγωνίσματα γὰρ ποιῶντες καὶ παρὰ δύναμιν παρατείνοντες πολλάκις ἀναγκάζονται διαστρέφειν τὸ ἐφεξῆς." There is evidence also that actors altered texts for their own convenience, as the schol. writes on one passage of the true reading, μετέπλασαν διὰ τὸ δέκφορον, and what had thus been heard in the theatre was very likely to make its way into the texts; for as Boeckh says: "paucos tum dramatum codices habebant; audiebantur magis quam legebantur." We have then remarks on the practice of the Roman adapters of Greek plays, with quotations from Terence; where it may be permitted to remark that Naber does not seem to be at his best in the prosody of the Latin comic poets; for he quotes two lines which cannot be made to scan and which do not appear as he prints them in the modern editions. To show that what Terence confesses to have been his own practice is not so monstrous after all: "ipsam rem ne quis miretur, scito etiam hodie idem fieri, et adscribam recens exemplum, quod Paulo Lindavio debeo, qui ostendit Sardovii Odettam, quam nuper Parisienses plausu exceperunt, διασκευῆν esse Marii Uchardi Flamminae, cui fabulae quaedam accessere ex Pauli Giacometti fabula *Culpa culpam vindicat*." He recurs now to the Greek poets and makes some interesting remarks about the Hippolytus. After quoting Valckenaer's opinion as to the relation of the second to the first edition, he says he partly agrees with it, but "iam ante triginta annos me tetigit suspicio de Phaedra summum virum errare, et nunc occasione oblata fortasse mihi concedetur ut tandem modeste ut decet significem cur ita putem. Primum retractatione fabula διασκευασμένη non necessario fit melior, saepeque factum existimo quod Boeckhius scribit . . . 'in emendando fieri solet ut pro mendis quae deleas maiora committas.'" And then he goes on to give strong reasons for the opinion that in the original scheme of the play it was the nurse and not Phaedra who contrived that Theseus should find in the hand of his dead wife the letter accusing Hippolytus of crime. In particular he refers to the words of Artemis, l. 1310, ἡ δ' εἰς ἔλεγχον μὴ πέσῃ φοβουμένη | ψευδεὶς γραφὰς ἔγραψε καὶ διώλεσε | δόλοισι σὸν παῖδ' and shows that it is the τροφός who has been last spoken of, and that it was she "quae φοβουμένη μὴ πέσοι εἰς ἔλεγχον, h. e. μὴ βασανισθεῖν, eam fraudem excogitavit." There is only one line, 1288, in which Phaedra is said to have written the letter, and these lines "nisi omnia me fallunt, accessere demum in altera editione." To confirm his opinion he quotes from Racine, who, after saying that he has toned down some features of his original, writes: "J'ai cru que la calomnie avait quelque chose de trop bas et de trop noir pour la mettre dans la bouche d'une Princesse, qui a d'ailleurs des sentimens si nobles et si vertueux. Cette bassesse m'a paru plus convenable à une Nourrice, qui pourrait avoir des inclinations plus serviles et qui néanmoins n'entreprend cette fausse accusation que pour sauver la vie et l'honneur de sa maitresse."

The next article, pp. 190-202, is by Prof. Badham, on the eighth book of Plato's *Leges*, his notes on the seventh having already appeared in his edition of the *Philebus*. These criticisms involve a larger amount of quotation and discussion than is compatible with this notice. He says himself "si ostendere voluero quot quantaque in Edd. nostris corruptelae etiam lateant, longiores aliquae *ρήσεις* erunt apponendae, praesertim quoniam saepe factum est ut orationis ambitus in singula membra prave dispertitus novis erroribus et futilibus supplementis occasionem praeberit. Quid ergo? Num Platonis studiosi τὰ μήκη, dummodo πρὸς τὸν λόγον uerint, reformidaturi erant? Haud credo; itaque ab initio incipiamus." A single short example may be given. In p. 846d it is said that citizens must be left free from handicrafts that they may have leisure for their civil duties, τέχνην γὰρ ἱκανὴν πολλῆς ἀσκήσεως ἅμα καὶ μαθημάτων πολλῶν δεομένην κέκτηται πολίτης ἀνὴρ τὸν κοινὸν τῆς πόλεως κόσμον σώζων καὶ κτῶμενος, οὐκ ἐν παρέργῳ δεόμενον ἐπιτηδεύειν. "Ecquis Graece dici posse credit τοῦτο δέεται ἐπιτηδεύειν? Ipsum *curatoris egere* diceret. Sed facillima est correctio, κόσμον—οὐκ ἐν παρέργῳ δεχόμενον ἐπιτηδεύεινΣΙΝ."

The last article, pp. 203-24, contains "Nova studia ad Antiphontem," by van Herwerden. The *Studia Antiphontea* recently published by I. I. Hartman in a program of the Leyden Gymnasium excited Herwerden to a renewed study of this orator, and he finds that Hartman, as well as Iernstedt and Blass, have left some obscurities still to be cleared up. Room may perhaps be found for a note on i 17, ἡ οὖν παλλακὴ τοῦ Φιλόνεω ἠκολούθει τῆς θυσίας ἔνεκα, καὶ ἐπειδὴ ἦσαν ἐν τῇ Πειραιεῖ, οἷον εἰκὸς ἔθνον. καὶ ἐπειδὴ αὐτῷ (i. αὐτοῖς cum Iernst.) ἐτέθντο [τὰ ἱερὰ dele] ἐντεῦθεν ἐβουλεύετο ὁ ἄνθρωπος ὕπως (ἀν dele cum Hartm. sed praeterea requiro ὅποτε *quando*) αὐτοῖς τὸ φάρμακον δοίη, πότερα πρὸ δείπνου ἢ ἀπὸ δείπνου. ἔδοξεν οὖν αὐτῇ βουλευομένη βέλτιον εἶναι ματὰ δείπνον δοῖναι, τῆς (i. ταῖς cum A. pr. et Cobeto) Κλυταμνήστρας τῆς τούτου μητρὸς ὑποθήκας ἅμα διακονοῦσα. "Correxerunt syntaxim eruditi rescribendo διακονοῦσαν, sed haud temere dixit Hartman se verba ἅμα διακονοῦσαν non intelligere. Neque ego hercle intelligo; nam ne hoc quidem, ut post coenam potius quam ante coenam venenum daret, Philonei uxor pellici suaserat. Sed optimam sententiam ista verba, scripta ut leguntur in libris, praebebunt, si mecum transposueris in paragraphi initium hoc modo: ἡ οὖν παλλακὴ τοῦ Φιλόνεω ἠκολούθει τῆς θυσίας ἔνεκα, ταῖς Κλυταμνήστρας τῆς τούτου μητρὸς ὑποθήκας ἅμα διακονοῦσα, i. e. *non solum festi causa, sed etiam* (ἅμα) *sic nacta occasionem obsequendi scelestae mulieris consiliis.*" On v 24, ἐπειδὴ δ' ὁ ἄνθρωπος οὐτ' ἐν τῇ Μυτιλήνῃ ἐφαίνετο ζητούμενος οὐτ' ἄλλοθι οὐδαμοῦ, he writes: "Hartman: 'Mytilenem missus erat pedisequus qui nuntiaret Herodem exisse ex navi nec rediisse, non qui eum ibi quaereret.' Optime admonet, et iamdudum male me ea res habuit. Ubi vero quaeso hominem quaesituri erant praeterquam ubi ἀφανὴς ἐγένετο, i. e. in agro Methymnaeo? Cf. §21 et 23. Quare non dubito oratori aut reddendum esse ἐν τῇ Μηθυμναίᾳ aut ἐν τῇ λιμένι, cl. §27 ζητούμενον δὲ τοῦ ἀνδρὸς δὴ ἡμέρας καὶ ἐν τῇ λιμένι καὶ ἀπὸθεν τοῦ λιμένος, quod fortasse etiam praestat. Fortasse in vetusto codice litterarum ΤΩΙ ΑΙΜΕΝΙ non nisi prima et posteriores aegre legi potuerunt, ita ut librarius T . . . ΔΗΝΗ dispicere sibi videretur, quae pro reliquiis nominis ΘΗ ΜΥΤΙΑΝΗ paulo ante lecti habuerit."

Vol. XI, Pt. 3.

This part opens (pp. 225-31) with a continuation of Herwerden's notes on Hartman's *Studia Antiphontea*. In VI 21, the common text gives ἀναβὰς ἐγὼ εἰς τὸ δικαστήριον τοῖς αὐτοῖς δικασταῖς ἔλεξα, ὅτι τὸν μὲν νόμον οὐ δίκαιον οὐ προκαθιστάτῃ Φιλοκράτῃ κατηγορῶν καὶ διαβάλλων εἰς τὸ δικαστήριον, μελλόντων ἔσεσθαι μοι ἀγώνων πρὸς Ἀριστίωνα καὶ Φίλινον αὐριον καὶ τῇ ἔνῃ. "Verba funditus depravata alii aliter tentarunt. Equidem suspicor: ὅτι τῶν μὲν νομίμων οὐ δικαίως (hucusque cum Dobreo) ἄμοιρόν με καθιστάτῃ Φιλοκράτῃ, κτλ. Adiectivo ἄμοιρος ex pedestribus praeter Platonem usus est Demosthenes. Dobree: ὅτι τῶν μὲν νομίμων οὐ δικαίως προαγορεύει εἰργεσθαι Φιλ. Sed καθιστάτῃ tam aptum est, ut corruptela natum esse parum sit probabile." §24: καὶ αὐτοὶ οἱ δικασταὶ καὶ ἕτεροι ἰδιῶται πολλοί. "Hartman 'si quid video, aut ἕτεροι aut ἰδιῶται eiciendum est.' At saepe ἕτερος et ἄλλος Graeci usurparunt, ubi nos cum Latinis utimur adverbio, quale est *praeterea*. Praesertim considerandi sunt poetarum loci qui propter metrum non potuerunt interpolari, ex quibus nunc memini loci Aristophanei ex Avibus vs. 152: ἄλλ' εἰσὶν ἕτεροι τῆς Λοκρίδος Ὀπούντιοι, cf. Blaydes, ad Soph. Philoct. 38." §46: "Haesit Hartman in verbis: καίτοι ἱκανά γ' ἦν ὑπομνήσαι καὶ ἐνθυμηθῆναι, εἴπερ ἡδικοῦντο, ἀμφοτέρα καὶ σφῶν αὐτῶν ἔνεκα καὶ τῆς πύλεως. Optime dicitur ἱκανόν τί ἐστιν ὑπομνήσαι τινα, *idoneum est aliquod, quod aliquem moneat de aliqua re*, optime item ἱκαῖόν τί ἐστιν ἐνθυμηθῆναι (= ἐνθύμιον ποιήσασθαι) *idoneum est aliquid quod religioni habeas, quod religionem tibi incutiat*. Paulo sane liberius orator duas structuras aliquantum, fateor, diversas coniunxit, sed non satis hoc causae esse arbitror, cur verbum aptissimum et paene necessarium ἐνθυμηθῆναι cum Hartmano ei abiudicemus, tribuentes 'semi-docto,' quem quid movere potuerit ut id adscriberet, haudquam equidem assequor."

The next article (pp. 232-6) is by J. J. Cornelissen, on Cornelius Nepos. He expresses the pleasure with which he read Cobet's recent edition. "Ut appareret autem quanta cura quantoque studio Magistri praestantissimum opus prosecutus et amplexus sim, pauculos annotavi locos, qui nondum ita editi viderentur, ut nullam corruptelae suspicionem moverent. Vix opus est monere in segete, ex qua COBETUS uberrimam quasi emendationum messem collegisset, mihi singulas tantum spiculas quasdam corradendas relictas esse." Of the corrections proposed, not many seem important, and only two or three nearly certain. In Them. i 3, *nam cum iudicasset sine summa industria non posse eam [contumeliam] extinguī, totum se dedit rei publicae*, he proposes *nisi* for *sine*. In Alc. VI 4, *postquam in astu venit, contione advocata sic verba fecit, ut nemo tam ferus fuerit quin eius casui illacrimaret*, he suggests *ferreus* for *ferus*. In Han. V 2, *obducta nocte sarmenta in cornibus iuvencorum deligata incendit eiusque generis multitudinem magnam dispalatam immisit*, he reads *dispalatum*, "ut Latinitati consulatur."

The next article (pp. 237-45) is by Badham, entitled *Paralipomena in Platonis Libris de Legibus I, II, III, IV*. One or two short extracts may be made. P. 653a: "Mox in ipsa τῆς παιδείας definitione misere turbata sunt omnia. Sed ex rei natura locus satis certe restitui potest: leg. παιδείαν δὲ λέγω τὴν παραγινομένην πρῶτον παισὶν ἀρετὴν, ὅταν ἡδονή τε καὶ φίλια καὶ λύπη τε καὶ μῖσος ὁρθῶς ἐν ψυχαῖς ἐγγένωνται μήπω δυναμένων λόγον λαμβάνειν, λαβόντι δὲ

τ. λ. συμφωνήσωσι, τῷ [λόγῳ] ὁρθῶς εἰθίσθαι ὑπὸ τῶν προσηκόντων ἑθῶν. Αὐτὴ δ' ἔσθ' ἡ συμφωνία κτέ. 'etsi ipsi rationem nondum assecuti sunt, concordant cum eo qui hanc iam habet,' h. e. disciplina est assuefactio eorum, quae ratio post modo probabit." P. 659d: "Nemo unquam interpretabitur καλὰ μέλη δεῖ μεταχειρίζεσθαι . . . ταῖς ξυνηθείαις τοὺς ἐν ταῖς πόλεσι νέους. Lacunae signum ibi posui ubi sententia hiare videbatur. Aliquid huiusmodi intercidisse conicio: (οὕτως ὥστε ξυνήθεις γενέσθαι, καὶ μηδέποτε μηδὲν ἐναντίον ταύταις διδάσκεισθαι) ταῖς ξυνηθείαις τοὺς ἐν τῇ πόλει νέους."

J. J. Cornelissen follows (pp. 246-59) with notes 'Ad Scriptores Historiae Augustae,' as edited by Jordan and Eyssenhardt, 1863. These contain a large number of short verbal criticisms, but do not present any matter of general interest. The first may be taken as a specimen. Ael. Spartiani Hadrianus 7, 10 *ad honores explendos non solum amicis sed etiam passim aliquantis multa largitus est. Legendum est sed etiam passim aliis quamvis multa l. e.*" The corrections proposed are, in many cases, ingenious and exceedingly probable.

Cobet next devotes two pages to a "gravis Athenaei error in loco Timaei historici." Aelian, borrowing from the 12th book of Athenaeus, says that Smindyrides of Sybaris, when he came to woo Agariste, ἐπάγεσθαι χιλίους μὲν μαγείρους τοσοούτους δὲ ὀρνιθευτὰς καὶ ἀλειεὺς χιλίους. In Athenaeus himself we read: εἶποντο γοῦν αὐτῷ χίλιοι μάγειροι καὶ ὀρνιθευταί. 'Ιστορεῖ περὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ Τιμαῖος ἐν τῇ ἐβδόμῃ. In another passage, Ath. says χιλίους συνεπήγετο οἰκέτας ἀλειεὺς καὶ ὀρνιθευτὰς καὶ μαγείρους. So Aelian has tripled the number. "An igitur Timaeus haec deliramenta serio memoriae prodidit? minime gentium. Reprehenditur acerbè a Polybio et aliis, sed non insaniebat tamen. Sed quid cesso locupletem testem ipsum Timaeum producere, qui optime hoc crimen purgaturus est?" Then a passage from Diod. Sic., also borrowed from Timaeus, is cited, in which we learn that this suitor ἀναχθῆναι ἐκ Συβάρεως ἐν πεντηκοντόρῳ τοὺς ἐρέτας ἔχοντα ΙΔΙΟΥΣ οἰκέτας, ὧν εἶναι τοὺς μὲν ἀλειεὺς τοὺς δὲ ὀρνιθοθήρας. As in other cases, so here, "Athenaeus dormitans, quum esset scriptum 'ΙΔΙΟΥΣ, sibi visus est ΧΙΑΙΟΥΣ videre. Decepit Aelianum, sed posthac neminem, ut spero, decepturus est."

In the next forty pages, Cobet contributes notes on Stein's edition of Herodotus, book III. There are some two hundred of them; and, though nearly all are worth attention, very few are of such general interest as to be available for this notice. But a few specimens may be quoted; III 7: σάξαντες ὕδατι. "Sic unus omnium Codex R pro ἔλξαντες, solus, ut tam saepe alibi, servans antiquam scripturam. Quod in libris est ἔλξαντες ne Graecum quidem est, nam ἔλκω habet futurum ἔλξω, sed aoristum εἴλκυσσα, non εἴλξα, nisi apud ineptos scriptores sequioris aetatis, Philostratum similesque, qui et εἶρψα dicebant pro εἶρπυσσα." III 22: "Post pauca ab R accipe οὐδὲν ἔφη θαυμάζειν pro ἔφη οὐδέν. Non est enim Graecum φημί οὐ θαυμάζειν sed οὐ φημι θαυμάζειν. Ut οὐ φάναι est negare, οὐκ εἶναι vetare, οὐκ ἀξιοῦν et οὐ δικαιοῦν nolle, οὐ δοκεῖν dissimulare, οὐ συμβουλεύειν dissuadere, ut VII 46, οὐ συμβουλεύων Ξέρξη στρατεῦσθαι ἐπὶ τὴν Ἑλλάδα." III 37: ἐς τοῦ Ἡφαίστου τὸ ἱρὸν ἦλθε καὶ πολλὰ τῷ ἀγάλματι κατεγέλασε. Cf. III 38: "ἱροῖσι τε καὶ νομαίοισι . . . κατεγελᾶν. III 155: δεινὸν τι ποιούμενος Ἀσσυρίους Πέρσησι καταγελᾶν. IV 79: ἡμῖν καταγελᾶτε. VII 9: Ἴωνας . . . οὐκ ἔασεις καταγελᾶσαι ἡμῖν. Sine controversia hi loci omnes labem

et vitium contraxerunt. Ubi κατὰ cum dativo iungi poterit, tum demum καταγελᾶν τινί pro τινός recte dictum erit. Vera ratio uno tantum loco reperitur V 68: ἐνθα καὶ πλείστον κατεγέλασε τῶν Σικυννίων. Fieri potest ut veteres glossae ἐγχάσκειν, ἐγχανεῖν perierint, fieri potest ut verbum ἐμπαίζειν usurpaverit, fieri potest ut forma tragica ἐγγελᾶν τινί Herodotus usus fuerit, sed ut rectum sit τῷ ἀγάλματι κατεγέλασε et similia, id vero fieri non potest." III 38: ὁρθῶς μοι δοκεῖ Πίνδαρος ποιῆσαι νόμον πάντων βασιλέα [φῆσας] εἶναι. "Insititium et spurium est φῆσας additum ab eo qui quid esset ποιῆσαι (in carmine dixisse) non intellexerat. Vulgata significat: recte fecit quod dixit, sed non est haec Hérodoti sententia." III 80: κῶς δ' ἂν εἴη χρῆμα κατηρτημένον μονναρχίῃ, τῇ ἐξεστὶ ἀνευθίνῃ ποιεῖν τὰ βούλεται: "Recte emendavit H. Stephanus κατηρτημένον, quod Stein ne commemoravit quidem, fortasse quia, ut Schweighauserus scribit: 'vulgatum tuentur libri omnes.' Quasi vero quis nunc nesciat H et IΣ sexcenties in libris omnibus inter se permisceri. Equidem nego umquam Graecis verbum κατηρτᾶν in usu fuisse. Quidquid tamquam inde natum profertur lectiones sunt corruptae verborum ex κατηρτίζω natorum, ut κατηρτημένον pro κατηρτισμένον. Sic, V 106, pro κατηρτήσω in verbis ἵνα τοι κείνα πάντα κατηρτήσω ἐς τῶντό Reiske optime correxit κατηρτίσω ab omnibus probatum. In libro IX 66, Stein edidit ἤγε κατηρτημένως sprete unice vera scriptura, quam solus R habet κατηρτισμένως."

Pp. 303-22 are occupied by a continuation of Naber's article on the Nubes of Aristophanes. He finds some difficulty still in coming to the point, and begins by mentioning "exempla quaedam fabularum quas alii correxerunt et detulerunt in certamen," the details of which "unicuique facile est ex Meinekii Historia Critica conquirere." At last he says "Venio ad Aristophanem, qui ut alia taceam, bis dicitur docuisse Nubes et Plutum." As to the latter, it has been shown more recently and completely, by E. W. H. Brentano, that "duae fuerunt comoediae, quae praeter titulum et personam Pluti vix quidquam commune habuerunt, nostra autem fabula potissimum refert Plutum posteriorem, cui ex priore quaedam admixta sunt." Brentano thinks, however, "eas contaminationes ad Byzantina tempora detrudendas esse." This Naber considers altogether improbable, nor can he see "quidni τὴν διασκευὴν ad illa tempora referam, quae Aristophanis aetatem proxime secuta sunt." He attaches great weight to the fourth and sixth arguments, and infers from their statements that the first edition of the Clouds was a comparative failure, gaining only the third prize; that Aristophanes prepared an altered edition, which was represented within three or four years, but failed even more completely, and was, from that time, neglected by the poet, who "rediit ad primam recensionem, quam postea credibile est saepe fuisse actam. Hinc est factum ut hodie habeamus textum, qui Nubes priores potissimum refert, cum in aliis αὖ διασκευαὶ fere aetatem tulerint." The writer of the sixth argument had in his possession the play as we now have it, as well as the original edition, and carefully compared the two; but had no knowledge of the "Nubes posteriores," prepared by the poet himself, "quae propter causam quam dixi mature periissent." "Sequitur nos habere Nubes priores, quibus ex posterioribus Nubibus quaedam non nimis apte agglutinata sunt: haec origo est Nubium, quas tertias adeo dicere poterimus. Est autem probabilis suspicio, non ipsum poetam fabulam contaminatione, sed brevi post Aristophanem mortuum nescio quis contulit in unum

quae sibi in utraque fabula egregie placebant. Contaminata fabula in scena agi non potuit, quod omnes viderunt. . . . Priores Nubes norant omnes, posteriores latebant et postquam fabula semel spectata fuerat, eam Aristophanes oblivioni tradiderat. Unicum exemplar, quod forte supererat, invenit is, ad quem Aristophanis libri pervenerunt, filius, nepos, fortasse alius quidam: hic *lectorum* in gratiam contaminando tertiam fabulam fecit, quae postquam diu simul cum prioribus Nubibus circumlata fuit, tandem sola expetebatur, sola legebatur, sola denique salva ad nos pervenit propter eximiam disputationem inter τὸν δίκαιον et τὸν ἀδίκον λόγον, quam in prioribus Nubibus lectores aegre desiderabant." It is assumed by Naber and by Brentano, whom he here follows, that the writer of the sixth argument correctly attributes to the second edition of the play the dispute between the two λόγοι. In order that this may be in accordance with the facts, as Naber takes them, it is necessary to expunge from Plato's Apology the thrice-made allusion to this, καὶ τὸν ἥττω λόγον κρείττω ποιεῖν. He shows some not very cogent reasons for thinking these words interpolated where they occur. He thus sums up the difference between the two plays as he conceives it: "In prioribus Nubibus Socrates et Chaerephon ridebantur propter ineptum naturae et grammaticae studium: ἄθεοι sunt et ὑπόμωροι, sed minime mali. In posteriore comoedia Chaerephontis nullae partes fuerunt, Socrates autem exagitabatur et repraesentabatur tanquam omnium odio et contemptu dignus, quippe qui iuventutem corrumpere et artem teneret, qua posset ὁ ἥττων λόγος vincere τὸν κρείττονα. In priore fabula Socratis discipuli discunt λέγειν, sed si ea disciplina abutuntur, nihil hoc ad Socratem, cuius est perridicula docendi methodus, sed quae neminem corrumpet nisi qui iam ante corruptus hoc aget ut deterius corrumpatur. In secunda fabula Socrates merus est Sophista Protagorae instar." In the concluding portion of his paper, Naber endeavors to assign various parts of the existing play to the first or second edition, in accordance with these views. But in doing this he attributes some to the first edition which seem to imply the moral obliquity of Socrates' school, as much as other passages which are relegated to the second. E. g., v. 99, διδάσκουσ' ἀργύριον ἦν τις διδῶ | λέγοντα νικᾶν καὶ δίκαια κἀδίκαια.

H. W. van der Mey follows (pp. 323-31) with notes on Thucydides. The exhortations of Herwerden have incited him to publish, at once, his observations, instead of postponing them to some other occasion. He remarks that Herwerden's edition shows that emendations of the text of Thucydides consist very largely in the removal of *emblemata*; and though much has been done, still some gleanings have been left, and "equidem hoc gratae et laudabilis negligentiae beneficio usus has spicas legi." One specimen only can be given, I 19, καὶ οἱ μὲν Λακεδαιμόνιοι οὐχ ὑποτελεῖς ἔχοντες φόρον τοὺς ξυμμάχους ἡγοῦντο, κατ' ὀλιγαρχίαν δὲ σφίσι μόνον ἐπιτηδείως ὅπως πολιτεύουσιν θεραπεύοντες. "Utrum Lacedaemonii artem imperandi ita exercebant ut sociis obsequium tribuerent, an socii maiestatem Lacedaemoniorum comiter conservabant? Magis cum utrorumque condicione consentaneum foret si pro θεραπεύοντες legeretur θεραπεύοντας (!) Praeterea sic altera pars sententiae habere quod verbis οὐχ ὑποτελεῖς oppositum esset, et verba ὅπως πολιτεύουσιν sponte sua migrarent in marginem, unde in orationem scriptoris se intulerunt." Besides the fancied *emblemata*, which are here detected, we have a few notes of a more general character; the first of which is as follows: I 6. 2, σημείον δ' ἐστὶ ταῦτα τῆς Ἑλλάδος ἐτι οὕτω

νεμόμενα κτέ. "Adverbium οὕτω indicat non ταῦτα sed τὰ veram esse lectionem."

At the end of this part (pp. 332-6), Herwerden begins some notes on the Republic of Plato. As a specimen may be quoted P. 337 D.: "τί οὖν, ἔφη (Thrasymachus), ἂν ἐγὼ δείξω ἑτέραν ἀπόκρισιν παρὰ πάσας ταύτας [περὶ δικαιοσύνης abesse malim] βελτίω [τούτων abesse malim], τί ἀξιοῖς παθεῖν; Τί ἄλλο, ἦν δ' ἐγώ, ἢ ὅπερ προσήκει πάσχειν τῷ μὴ εἰδότε; προσήκει δέ που μαθεῖν παρὰ τοῦ εἰδότος· καὶ ἐγὼ οὖν τοῦτο ἀξιῶ παθεῖν. Ἦδὺς γὰρ εἰ, ἔφη, ἀλλὰ πρὸς τῷ μαθεῖν καὶ ἀποτίσων [l. ἀποτίσων] ἀργύριον. Stephanum requirentem πρὸς τὸ μαθεῖν recte quidem redarguit Stallbaum alludi dicens formulae indiciali τί ἀξιοῖς παθεῖν ἢ ἀποτεῖσαι, sed tamen non temere Stephanus haesisse mihi videtur in vulgata scriptura. Quippe nimis inepte in Thrasymachi responso conjunguntur praemium et poena, nec fere dubito quin Plato eum fecerit respondentem: ἀλλὰ πρὸς τῷ παθεῖν (quemadmodum tu τὸ μαθεῖν vocas) καὶ ἀποτίσων ἀργύριον: *suavis es, si putas te ut vulgus damnatorum aut poena aut multa affectum iri; imo praeter poenam pecuniam mihi solves*. Sic demum lepide haec dicta sunt." P. 360 D.: ἀληθῆ οἰόμενος, ὥς φησιν ὁ περὶ τοῦ τοιούτου λόγον λέγων. "Non est haec Graeca oratio. Sententia postulat: *quemadmodum contendit huius sermonis auctor, i. e. lingua Platonica: ὥς φησιν ὁ πατήρ τοῦ τοιούτου λόγου*. Cf. Theaet. 164 E; Symp. 177 D; Phaedr. 274 E. Posteaquam ex πῆρ, i. e. πατήρ, factum est περί, corrector addidit λέγων."

C. D. MORRIS.

HERMES, 1883.

No. III.

E. Maas, Tibullische Sagen. Tibullus holds an exceptional place amongst the Augustan poets in the use of myths. There is comparatively little mythological book-learning in his elegies. This trait, however, according to Maas, has a few exceptions. Maas argues that the Sibyl, who foretells things to Aeneas, in II 5, is not the Sibyl of Cumae, but a Trojan Sibyl, the product of the Hellenistic era, and probably coined by Pergamenian scholars. Attempting to get at the further tradition of this legend, Maas suggests the freedman of Sulla, L. Cornelius Alexander Polyhistor, as the sponsor of the fable to the Roman public.

E. Hiller, Die Tibullische Elegiensammlung. H. discusses, *e. g.*, the spurious Priapea, charging Scaliger with some hurried work. As regards the extensive borrowing of phrases and sentiments, in III 5, 15-20 (Lygdamus), from three passages of Ovid (Ars Am. II 669 sqq.; Trist. IV 10, 5; Am. II 14, 23), Hiller suggests that these lines were inserted by the author himself, in preparing a later copy of the poem as a present to some patron, Messalinus, *e. g.*

E. Albrecht, Beitrage zur Textkritik des Isaïos. On pp. 362-74 the author attempts to point out interpolations, partly such as were intended by their authors to supply apparent defects of the traditional text, partly those which originally were mere marginal notes, not designed as interpolations.

On pp. 374-81, H. proposes a number of changes, based purely on the observation of normal structure and phraseology.

A. Köhler (Nuremberg) some time ago, in the Vatican, discovered new MSS

of two Latin medical writers, *Pseudopliurus* and *Cassius Felix*, which he discusses on pp. 382-95.

U. Wilamowitz, Phaëthon. W. offers an attempt to reconstruct the Euripidean drama Phaëthon from the *reliquiae*. The current and familiar version of the legend is due to Ovid's elaboration. The fable of Euripides differs greatly. In it there is involved, apparently, a twofold action; one leading to the fall of Phaëthon, and the other leading to the discovery of the guilt of his mother Clymene. Merops, the ostensible father of Phaëthon and actual husband of Clymene, is presented as a man of coarse and overbearing demeanor, who proposes to marry his reputed son to an heiress of vast wealth. To escape from this necessity, Phaëthon resorts to the neighboring palace of Helios and insists upon receiving the fulfilment of a promise once given. In the beginning of his career, however, Phaëthon, without causing universal wreck, is hurled to the earth by Zeus, and Helios, who seems to have attended his son on a steed, at once resumes the guidance of his own chariot.

Robert, in a paper suggested by the preceding, discusses the Phaëthon legend in Hesiod, and states that the same is substantially preserved in Hyginus. References in Schol. on Odyssey λ, 325, p. 1689 (Eustathius), in Plato, Tim. 22, c; Plut. de Tranq. animi, p. 466, point to the Hesiodic version as being current and permanent.

M. Fränkel, Die Antidosis. Two new views on this odd contrivance of Attic law have been presented since Boeckh's time. Boeckh held that the offer of exchanging possessions or fortunes (*ἀντιδίδοναι*) under the Attic law could result in actual and permanent exchange; viz. in case a citizen (called upon to perform a *leitourgia*) believed that a citizen of ampler means had been passed by, he challenged the latter to do one of two things: either to assume the liturgy, or to exchange estates, the latter process, of course, being carried out under the verdict of the proper courts.

In 1872, Dittenberger published a new view of *Antidosis*. He refuses to believe that actual or permanent exchange of estates on the part of the litigants was actually intended or carried into effect. The parties took charge of one another's property for the purpose merely of furnishing sworn affidavits to the court, concerning the assets of the other side. The court thereupon decided which of the two parties was the richer, and adjudged the latter liable to perform the liturgy. After this, each party resumed his own property. This is the view of *antidosis* which Fränkel supports in the present paper. At the same time, Fränkel attempts to invalidate both the view of Boeckh and the more recent one of Thalheim (Fleckeisen's Jhbb. 1877, p. 613), concurred in by Lipsius and Gilbert: the parties could take possession of one another's property in such a manner that he who was challenged as having a prior obligation to perform the liturgy could specify particular parcels of property which he wished to exchange, and the *antidosis* comprised two things: (1) a decision as to the proportion of relative possessions; (2) the actual exchange. Fränkel looks upon Thalheim's view as inferior to that of Boeckh.¹

¹ Reasonable doubt may be entertained whether Fränkel has made out his own case. Demosth. (Mid. 79) seems to be plainly inconsistent with Fränkel's view; it is hard to see how temporary possession could enable the party offering *ἀντιδοσις* to remit suits instituted by the actual possessor, viz. suits concerning the property claimed in exchange.—E. G. S.

No. IV.

Th. Bergk, *Philologische Paralipomena*. Notable among these is the second, "Ueber die Abfassungszeit der *Andromache*." The date which Bergk considers to accord best with the numerous political allusions and invectives of the play is 423 B. C. (Ol. 89, 2), when the exasperation of Athens against Sparta was at its height, at the time when in the one year's truce the Spartans refused to undo the work of Brasidas on the Thracian coast. Bergk's mastery of detail is very great, and special students of Euripides will do well to note this paper. Still, as regards method, it is noteworthy that even a veteran like Bergk manipulates the point of his argument, in the latter portion of his discourse, just as if it were a fixed and accepted fact, a subtle species of *petitio* which vitiates many a German classical paper.

The fourth paper is entitled "*De Libello περί Αθηναίων πολιτείας*." Bergk considers the much-discussed treatise very nearly contemporary with the *Birds* of Aristophanes, but esteems it a hopeless task to establish the author. His remarks are mainly critical and refer to definite passages in the text. Cobet's emendations of this text he values but lightly, and turns from them with the remark: "*Sed taedet plura confidentiae exempla, quae Cobetus hic et aliis locis edidit, percensere*."

Joh. Schmidt (Halle) reprints "The Médico-botanical Glossary of Siena." The terms explained in this vocabulary are mostly Greek, but written in Latin characters, abounding in corruption of orthography and transliteration. The explanations are mostly Latin, but Romance terminations are freely used also. Schmidt suggests that collections like the present one are based upon the alphabetical enumerations of the *φάρμακα ἀπλᾶ*, such as became customary, after the example of Galenus, with the medical writers who used Greek. The present compilation, according to Schmidt, is older than the 9th century A. D.¹

Th. Kock (Weimar), *Ein Capitel aus der formalen Logik, angewandt auf Aristoteles und Platon*. After having set forth the nature of contradictory antitheses in which the two members exhaust the sum-total of possible predication (*principium exclusi tertii*), Aristotle (*De Interpretatione* 7, p. 176, line 16), gives the following example:

All human beings are white
Not all human beings are white.

But as these two predications do not exclude a third, the example is false.

In Plato's *Protag.* 329c sqq., the aim of "Socrates" is to prove the following thesis: the cardinal virtues are substantially identical or indissoluble. In order to compel the assent of his principal interlocutor, "Socrates" confronts the latter with the following alternative: either personal probity (*δικαιοσύνη*) is pious, etc., or it is impious. But pious and impious, Kock holds, are not contradictory anti-

¹ The translations and explanations seem to mark a period of transition; we find the Latin genitive and also the periphrasis with *de*, e. g. No. 274 *semen oleastri*; 285 *Lauri folia*; 293 *uncula caballi*; 307 *grana uvae*, but 335 *flores de vite*; 409 *sugia de furno vitrario*. Romance forms the second declension are particularly frequent; 407 *atramento lucido*; 419 *gladiolo*; 346 *argento vivo*; 310 *serpullo*; 89 *aphalto judaico*, etc., etc., but 201 *laurus*; 206 *capriolum*; 189 *sucus*; 253 *cetrium*, etc.

theses, excluding further predication. One of the two *contrary* antitheses may be denied to a given subject, but thereby the affirmation of the opposite (or *polaric* antithesis, as K. aptly terms it) is by no means a logical resultant. Formal logic, as Kock correctly states, does not determine the number of possibilities intervening between two "polaric" antitheses.

There cannot be any doubt as to the sincerity of Plato in this argumentation. This, the positive part of the dialogue, is free from the irony which permeates the greater part of the work. It seems to me that, in this view of the matter, Kock is right, as against Stallbaum, Bonitz and others.

F. Leo (Kiel), *Lectiones Plautinae*. Leo discusses detailed points of diction in which the Atticism of the originals is patent, or allusions which Plautus did not succeed in eliminating, e. g. in *Mostellaria* 1151: *optumas frustrationes dederis in comoediis*, viz. an opportunity for ridiculing them on the stage. In accordance with this purely Attic sense (for in the Roman transcription there was no place for personal ridicule) Leo changes 1149 sqq.: Th. Quid ego nunc faciam? Tr. Si amicus *Diphilo aut Philemoni es* (previous reading: "si amicus Demipho aut Philonides") dicito eis quo pacto tuos te servos ludificaverit: optumas frustrationes dederis in comoediis. This specimen may serve to indicate the purport of the paper.

Th. Schiche, In Ciceros Briefen an Atticus. The MSS tradition of books XII-XIII, Schiche premises, does not present the exact limits of each separate letter, nor are the letters found in strictly chronological order. It may be useful to present Schiche's results in this matter:

In 46 B. C., XII: 2; 5, §4; 3; 4; 5 down to *Lucilium sua*; 6; 7; 8; 11; 1.

In 45 B. C., XII: 13; 14; 15; 16; 18; 17; 18a; 19; 20; 12; 22; 23; 24; 25; 26; 27; 28; 29; 33; 30; 31, §3, + 32; 31, §1 and 2; 34 + 35, §1; 35, §2, + 36; 37; 38, §1 and 2; 38, §3 and 4; 39; 40; 42 down to *scribam ad te*; 41; 42 from *venerat mihi* on, + 43; 44 + 45, §1, down to *verbis*; 26; 46 + 47, §1, down to *poteris*; 47 *de mustela* down to 48 *esse*; 45 from *de Attica* on; 50; 48 from *sentiebam* on, + 49; 51; 52; 53. XIII: 2, 1, down to *Erote*; 1; 27; 28 + 29, §1, down to *oportere*; 29, §2 and 3, + 30, §1, down to *dederas*; 31; 30, §2 and 3, from *commodum* on; 2, §2 and 3, + 3; 32; 5; 33, §§1-3; 4; 6; 5, from *de Caelio* down to *expedies*; 7, 1; 7, 2; 9; 10; 11; 12; 13 + 14; 15 + 16; 17 + 18; 19; 21, §§4-7; 20; 22; 8; 33, §4 and 5; 23; 24 + 25, §1, down to *opus est*; 25, from *de Andromene* on; 35 + 36; 43 + 44; 38; 39; 40; 41; 34; 9; 10; 21, §§1-3; 47b; 48; 37; 45; 46; 47a; 49; 50; 51; 52; 42.

Otto Richter prints a few supplementary notes on the Clivus Capitolinus. The first of these is of general interest to scholars: W. Dörpfeld (Mittheil. des Deutschen Archaeol. Inst. zu Athen, VII 3, p. 277 sqq.) has shown that the Greek foot-measure was not = 0.308 millimeter, but 0.296, and promises to prove that in Rome, down to the third century B. C., there was current an Italian foot-measure of 0.278 m. Thus, then, the apparent discrepancy between the data of Dionysius, concerning the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus, and the results of recent excavations may be explained.

E. G. SIHLER.

ARCHIV FÜR LATEINISCHE LEXIKOGRAPHIE UND GRAMMATIK. Erster Jahrgang. Heft 3.

This number is one of varied interest. It contains several articles which are based upon the material already received from the numerous collaborators: furnishing a good earnest of what may be expected in the future. A provisional specimen of the contemplated Thesaurus is given, pp. 427-36, embracing ? *Abacinus*-*Abalbus*.

The first article, pp. 321-8, entitled "Beobachtungen auf dem Gebiete des Mediciner-latein," is by G. Helmreich. He shows that, to prevent confusion between the plant *cucurbita* and the same word with the transferred meaning of cupping-glass, the latter was called by Celsus *cucurbitula*, by the elder Pliny *cucurbita medicinalis*, while Juvenal designates it as *ventosa cucurbita*, an expression evidently borrowed from the vulgar speech. In medical writers of a later date, *ventosa* alone is found, and this seems finally to have displaced *cucurbita*, passing over into the Romance languages, cf. Ital. and Span. *ventosa*, Fr. *ventouse*. The classical term for leech was *hirudo*, but Celsus used *sanguisuga*, which afterwards prevailed to such an extent that, in the fourth century, *hirudo* may be practically regarded as obsolete. Doubtless, the confusion with *hirundo*, in the popular pronunciation, contributed to this result. In the same way *cantabrum* supplanted *furfur*. A fine instance of the possibility of enriching the Latin vocabulary from Greek sources is furnished by the word *mulca*, evidently to be connected with *mulgeo*, ἀμέλγω, denoting a cooling drink made of sour milk. The word is given by Galen as Roman, and the earliest instance of its use in Latin is in Apicius, VII 308. Another cooling drink, perhaps of a less innocent nature, was *recentatum*, given by Alexander, of Tralles, as ῥεκεντάτον. *Girba*, a name for a kind of mortar, is shown to be of Semitic origin, and its repeated use by Cassius Felix furnishes further evidence in favor of his being an African.

On pp. 329-43, the editor, with his usual fulness and suggestiveness, discusses *pandus* and its derivatives, in the treatment of which the lexica are delightfully vague. Etymologically, *pandus* must be connected with *pandere*. To the same root belongs *Panda*, a name for the goddess of the harvest, so called, perhaps, as Wölfflin ingeniously suggests, because she causes the stalks to bend under the weight of the full ears. Tibullus speaks of *tuga panda*, but no author, before Sidonius, employs *aratrum pandum*. Vergil uses *pandas carinas*, a phrase derived from Ennius, while *puppis panda* belongs to the latest poetry. Many passages seem to prove that *pandus* properly denoted a concave rather than a convex curve. So Diomedes speaks of the sign for a short vowel as "*brevis virgula panda et contractior quasi c sursum spectans*." Accordingly, *nasum pandum* is a turned-up nose, a pug; and when Ovid applies the epithet to the unfortunate ass, reference is made, not to the belly, but to the back, sunk in from the weight of many burdens, just as Pliny, in speaking of the bees, says "*onustae remeant sarcina pandatae*." The word seems to have remained longest in use in the Spanish peninsula, and survives in the Span. *pando*, which the dictionary of the Spanish Academy of 1822 distinctly defines as concave. In a note, Otto Friedrich proposes to restore sense to Sergius Explan. in Donatum 4, 497, 2 K., by reading *peregrinum* for *femininum*.

Thielman contributes another instance of the use of the vulgar diminutive *satullus*, discussed by Buecheler on p. 103 of the Archiv.

J. H. Schmalz, pp. 344-9, shows how the use of the ablative absolute of the perfect deponent participle with an object, beginning in Sallust, with one example, was extended by Ovid and Livy and Valerius Maximus until, in the elder Pliny, it becomes quite frequent. The attitude of later writers, Christian and profane, toward this construction, is also stated, and an alphabetical list given of the verbs so used. The comparatively rare use of the plural of the perfect active potential and the perfect deponent is also discussed. The use of the perfect deponent potential in the singular is very rare, and Terence, And. 203, seems to furnish the earliest example: *ubivis facilius passus sim*, etc. Gitlbauer illustrates the value of verbal statistics by showing that Horatian usage requires us to read, in Odes, III 4, v. 43, *turbam*, and, in v. 47, *turmas*.

Wölfflin follows with an article on Rime in Latin, pp. 350-89, considering not so much the historical development, as the finished product. *Nātus* and *grātus* are correct rimes, *rātus* and *grātus* less correct. Rimes of inflexion merely, as of the infin. *are are, ere ere*, are excluded from the discussion; so, too, mere coincidence in a derivative suffix, and compounds having the same ending as *-ficus*, or *liticines* and *tubicines*. *Gemens* and *timens* constitute rimes, while *flens* and *gemens* do not; *res* and *spes* rime, so *ore* and *rubore*, since the nominatives differ, but not *victore* and *bellatore*, where the suffix is the same. Two positions are possible for the riming words. They are either immediately connected copulatively or disjunctively, *merus et verus, aut pictus aut fictus* (reimende Verbindungen), or each word closes a verse or half-verse in poetry, or parallel clauses in prose (Gliederreim or Satzreim). Some of the earliest formulae of incantation exhibit rimes of the first position, mostly inflexional. Plautus has not a few instances of strict rimes, although alliteration is a much more prominent feature of his verse: cf. Merc. prol. 25, *error, terror*; so Terence, Ad. 912, *sollicitando et pollicitando*; Eun. 236, *pannis annisque*. Cornificius exhorts to moderation in the use of this figure. The example he gives is one afterwards well worn, *satius est uti regibus quam uti malis legibus*. Classical writers take, in the main, the same stand as Cornificius. In his later orations, Cicero uses rimes very sparingly, while in the letters which have a more familiar tone, they are more frequent. Caesar, Livy, Seneca and the elder Pliny yield but few instances. Classical poetry made little effort in this direction. Ovid, who might have been a ready rimer, chose not to be. Horace has *vera meraque virtus* and *videt ridetque Philippus*. Most of the examples of Homoeoteleuton, cited by the grammarians, are instances of inflexional rimes. Rime acquires a new importance among the African writers, and here Apuleius is most fruitful, the examples being so numerous that it is difficult to classify them. Tertullian and Augustine carry the development still further, perhaps under the influence of the Hebrew rimes of Scripture. From Africa the riming tendency passes over to Europe, and later Christian writers furnish new instances. Rimes of the second position (Glieder or Satzreime) occur in the Saturnian verse, but not as a marked feature. In a magic formula, preserved by Varro, we have *Terra pestem teneto, salus hic maneto*, with which may be compared Verg. Ecl. 8, 80, *Limus ut hic durescit, et*

haec ut cera liquescit. Only a few examples of this form of rime can be gleaned from Plautus, Ennius and Lucretius, from Horace, Ovid and Vergil; but Seneca could not resist the temptation to use them. Here, again, the African writers lay aside all restraint. Apuleius is especially fond of Satzreim, and Tertullian invents new applications of it. (The question whether there is any outside influence at work here must be left to Semitic scholars.) Rime thus came into the church, and continued to be cultivated in modern poetry. An alphabetical list of words found in riming combinations concludes the article.

On p. 389, Havet points out the existence of the adverb *quodie* (δ?) analogous to *hodie* in several inscriptions, and recognizes the adverb rather than *quo die* in Cicero, Div. in Caec. 41.

The next article, by Franz Seck, on the suffix *aster, astra, astrum*, shows what advantages the co-operative method has for the collection of material.

The same is true of the remaining articles by Wölfflin, on the desiderative verbs, on the use of *tenuis* and of *abante*. The skill shown in the grouping of the facts, and the summing up of the results, leaves little to be desired.

In the Miscellen, numerous curious and difficult words are made the subject of brief remarks. The specimen of the Thesaurus given is so much superior, in point of completeness, to anything yet attempted in Latin lexicography, that we are filled with envy of the scholar of the future, let us hope the not very distant future, who shall have, at once, at his command a Thesaurus of the entire Latin language elaborated on the same scale.

M. WARREN.

JOURNAL ASIATIQUE. Série VIII, Tome II.

No. 2. Août-Septembre, 1883.

De Vogüé publishes the Greek and Aramaic texts of the great Palmyrene inscription, with translation, and a discussion of the commercial and political life of Palmyra in the first century of our era.

Guyard gives a new instalment of his Assyrian lexicographical notes.

Aymonier finishes his remarks on the old-Khmer inscriptions.

Joseph and Hartwig Derenbourg print fourteen unedited Sabeen inscriptions belonging to the Academy of Inscriptions and Belles-lettres, with grammatical and historical remarks.

Senart points out the value of ancient Indian inscriptions for linguistic and literary chronology, and remarks that the Açoka inscriptions prove that their alphabets were not then employed for the notation of classic Sanskrit; that their orthography is nevertheless influenced by etymological knowledge, which must be referred to the oral cultivation of the Vedic-religious language; and that the different versions of the Açoka monuments belong orthographically to two systems, one, the more learned, represented by the inscriptions of Kapur di Giri and Girnar, the second, more purely Pracrit and popular, embracing all the other inscriptions.

Halévy proposes, as etymology of Ashpenaz, Dan. I 3, the Persian *aspanj*, "hotel," and supposes that the Hebrew writer transferred the name of this place to the officer who had control of it.

Imbault-Huart gives a fragment of a journey in the Chinese province Kiang-su.

Tome IV. No. 2. Février-Mars, 1884.

Léon Feer continues his Buddhist Studies with a dissertation on "how one becomes a preta." A preta is a dead man, one who has gone before (*pra ita*), but one who has returned alive, moves, speaks, has needs, and suffers. His crime is avarice, refusal to give to others what they need. He is visited with terrible punishments, and is delivered by gifts bestowed by his relatives on the needy.

Clément Huart illustrates the important position held by women at Bagdad under the Abbasside Califs, by sketches of three female musicians, one of whom was attached to the harem of the Calif Motawakkil, the second was the slave of a private man, and the third seems to have been free. With all the differences in their positions and characters—for the Calif's slave was faithful to her master even after his death, while the others led dissolute lives—they had in common their talent as poets and musicians, for which they were honored and sought after.

Abel Bergaigne continues his studies in the lexicon of the Rigveda.

J. Halévy defends his construction of the Libyan alphabet against objections made by recent writers.

Stanislas Guyard describes a new Assyrian verb-stem *barû*, with the signification "to set, or set one's self, across, crosswise, manifest, be manifested, set a seal across, seal."

Rubens Duval suggests that the district called by the Syrian lexicographers "the upper country," is not Dilmān, but the neighborhood of Šahrazūr, the eastern part of Beth-Garmai.

Book notices. E. J. W. Gibb's Ottoman poems, translated into English verse, London, 1882, is warmly praised by Barbier-Meynard. Meynard expresses his gratitude to the Trustees of the British Museum for their Catalogue of Persian MSS, of which the third volume has now appeared.

C. de Harlez gives translations of some Manju texts, and earnestly commends the study of the language, especially as bearing on the comprehension of Chinese books and affairs.

No. 3. Avril-Mai-Juin.

Pognon completes his work on the Assyrian inscription of Meru-nirari I, correcting some details in his former papers, and adding a glossary of ideograms and words.

Clermont-Ganneau describes three spurious Phenician monuments: 1. A scarabaeus in the Louvre (No. 592 in Notice des antiquités assyriennes, etc.), with inscription, the whole copied from one in the British Museum (H. 433). 2. Bronze figurine in British Museum, marked 6-27-83-2, representing some quadruped, and containing the name Gadyaton. 3. Winged bull of terra cotta, sent to Clermont-Ganneau, by Mordtmann, from Constantinople, with the legend "Yehaumelek ben Yirpel," the name copied from this king's stele recently published by de Vogüé. Some of these forgeries seem to have been done in the East.

In his papers on Moslem numismatics and metrology, H. Sauvaire has now come to weights, which he here treats at great length. He begins by fixing the values of the principal legal weights, the dirhem at 3 gr. 0898, the mithkāl at 4 gr. 414, and then enumerates the others, giving references to authorities.

In chapter third of his study of the Piyadasi inscriptions, Senart discusses the edicts of Sahasarām, Rūpnāth, Bairat, and Bhabra, and the inscriptions of the grottoes of Barābar.

Stanislaus Guyard offers hypotheses, corrections and new suggestions for the Van inscriptions, with particular reference to Sayce's work.

Abel Bergaigne continues his studies in the lexicon of the Rigveda.

Zendik is a Moslem name for heretics, especially dualists and manichaeans, and is by the Arab Masudi derived from the Persian Zend, the name of the commentary on the Avesta. James Darmesteter points out that *zendik* is in fact borrowed from the Persian, but has nothing to do with the commentary; it is from the Avestan *zañda*, Pahlvi *zand*, "sorcery," and signifies "sorcerer."

C. H. TOY.

BRIEF MENTION.

Die Sprache der Mittelkentischen Evangelien (Codd. Royal 1 A 14 and Hatton 38). Ein Beitrag zur Englischen Grammatik, von MAX RIEMANN. Berlin, Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1883. 110 S.

The author makes a very full grammatical study of the language of the Anglo-Saxon Gospels contained in the above-mentioned two MSS of the *twelfth* century, the latest that we possess, basing his studies on the Cambridge edition projected by Kemble, who prepared part of St. Matthew, which, after his death, was completed and published by Hardwicke in 1858. The edition was completed by Prof. Skeat, who issued St. Mark, 1871, St. Luke, 1874, and St. John, 1878. Prof. Skeat, in his preface to St. Luke, determined the relation of the six MSS to each other, showing that the Hatton MS (H) was copied from the Royal (R), which was itself a copy of the Bodleian 441 (B). Riemann brings forward additional proofs that H was copied from R, and after a lengthy grammatical study (about 100 pages) of both the phonology and inflection, concludes that both of these MSS are of the same dialect, and that this is the Kentish, as appears from a brief comparison with the recognized Kentish monuments, the Glosses, the Paraphrase of the fifty-first psalm, and the Hymn "wuton wuldrian," and the much later Ayenbite of Inwyrt (ed. Morris for E. E. T. Society). While the grammar of the Gospels, as given in these MSS, is very full, the comparison is very brief. Riemann does not take into consideration the so-called Kentish Psalter (Zeuner, Halle, 1881), as both Sweet and Sievers have contested the correctness of this designation, and he thinks that it needs further confirmation. He takes exception to Skeat's dates, who assigned R to the reign of Stephen and H to that of Henry II, considering that Wanley, who assigned both to the reign of Henry II, is more nearly right, and that the apparent difference of language is due to the fact that R was copied from a more correct exemplar than H was, the copyist of R having introduced errors of his own. Prof. Skeat had assigned the Hatton Gospels to about 1170, and they are used by Dr. Murray, in his New English Dictionary, as c. 1160, so the Royal MS cannot well be placed later than 1150, and both belong to the Old English Transition period. A few misprints, not mentioned in the errata, have been noticed, the most important of which is (p. 6) "Dass R unmittelbar aus H abgeschrieben ist," etc., which should be "H aus R." An index would have aided reference.

S. Editha, sive Chronicon Vilodunense im Wiltshire Dialekt aus MS Cotton. Faustina B III. Herausgegeben von C. HORSTMANN. Heilbronn, Gebr. Henninger, 1883. VIII u. 116 S.

Horstmann continues his invaluable services to Middle English literature by the publication of this edition of St. Editha from the unique MS above mentioned. It is a poem of nearly 5000 lines, with alternate rime, but, as

Horstmann remarks at the close of his short preface, the rhythm of four accents is so rude that it does violence to every rule. It was published in 1830 by W. H. Black under the title *Chronicon Vilodunense*, and is thus cited in Dr. Murray's *New English Dictionary*, with the assigned date 1420, which Horstmann concurs in, as in the list of founders of the abbey of Wilton Henry V is mentioned as still living. The poem gives the history of the abbey from its origin as a priory with thirteen nuns under King Egbert (830), and the foundation of the abbey by King Alfred (890), on to King Edgar, whose daughter was St. Editha, and her mother was a novice of the abbey. Then follow the history of St. Editha, abbess of the monastery, her miracles during life and after death (984), the translation of her bones, and the numerous miracles performed by her, with occasional apparitions, during the reigns of various sovereigns down to Henry I. The MS contains also, in the same dialect and verse-measure, the legend of St. Etheldrede (printed in Horstmann's *A.-E. Legenden, Neue Folge*); these two constitute the sole certain monuments of the dialect of Wiltshire, and, therefore, from a linguistic point of view they are of the highest importance.

Horstmann rightly says: "Die Form ist noch ausserordentlich primitiv, der Satzbau ohne jede Neigung zur Periode, stete Wiederholungen nachschleppend; es ist als ob die Sprache und die Diktion nach Jahrhunderte zurückseien." Although not earlier than 1415-20, it is much more archaic than Robert of Brunne, over 100 years earlier. The poet shows himself to be a very learned man, familiar with the Latin literature of the time. "Der Stil," adds Horstmann, "ist chronikenhaft, naiv, und nicht ohne einen historischen Reiz, wie gerade eine solche urväterliche Schreibweise fesseln kann." It would be an interesting and valuable study to frame a grammar of the Wiltshire dialect from these two legends, and a real contribution to the history of the English dialects.

Wulfstan. Sammlung der ihm zugeschriebenen Homilien, nebst untersuchungen über ihre echtheit. Herausgegeben von A. NAPIER. I. Text und Varianten. Berlin, Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1883. X u. 318 S.

This work forms the fourth volume of the *Sammlung Englischer Denkmäler in kritischen Ausgaben*, the other volumes being J. Zupitza's edition of Aelfric's *Grammatik und Glossar*, I. Text und Varianten; A. Brandl's *Thomas of Erceldoune*; and G. Lüttke's *The Erl of Tolous and the Emperes of Almayn*. Napier proposes to print in critical form all the writings which have been ascribed to Wulfstan, Archbishop of York (1002-1023),¹ and then to settle those which were really written by him, basing his work upon Wanley's *Catalogue*, in which fifty-four Homilies are ascribed to Wulfstan. To these eight others are added, so that the volume contains sixty-two in all, but some are at once denied to Wulfstan and attributed to Aelfric and others. Twenty-three MSS have been examined, and this first part contains the Anglo-Saxon text and the MS variations, now printed for the first time, with a few exceptions. The second part will contain an investigation of the authorship.

¹ See also Napier's dissertation, *Ueber die Werke des altenglischen Erzbischofs Wulfstan*. Weimar, 1882.

Cynewulf's Elene, mit einem Glossar. Herausgegeben von J. ZUPITZA.
Zweite Auflage. Berlin, Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1883. VIII u.
80 S.

Zupitza has already found it necessary to issue a second edition of his Cynewulf's Elene, and in this edition he has made use of a collation of the MS by Knöll and one by R. Wülcker. The variations and conjectures of editors are given in foot-notes. It deserves notice that the glossary is arranged as in his A.-E. Übungsbuch, that is, the long vowels are not separated from the short ones, *e* is treated with *a*, *ea* stands before *eb*, *eo* before *ep*, *ie* before *if*, *io* before *ip*, initial *p* or *ð* after *y*, medial and final under *d*. This arrangement is a convenient one for editors to follow, offers a consistent plan, and is preferable to that of Heyne in his edition of "Beowulf." But the meanings of the words are given with too great conciseness, and in this respect the glossary is not equal to that of Heyne. It seems unnecessary to add another to the divisions of the Anglo-Saxon strong verbs as given by Grimm, Koch, Maetzner, and Sievers. That of Sievers might well have been followed, so that we might gradually attain some uniformity of nomenclature. A brief bibliography has been supplied, which increases the usefulness of this excellent edition.

Jahresbericht über die Erscheinungen auf dem Gebiete der germanischen Philologie. Herausgegeben von der Gesellschaft für deutsche Philologie in Berlin. Fünfter Jahrgang, 1883. Leipzig, Reissner, 1884.

This valuable journal has completed its fifth year, and has taken a high position in the bibliographical world. It embraces all departments of Teutonic philology, the special works and articles being distributed under twenty-two sections, whose titles I have not space to transcribe, but suffice it to say that they include lexicography, grammar, both general and special, dialectology, literary and social history, antiquities, mythology, paedagogy, and works and essays relating to each one of the Teutonic languages. A marked feature of the publication is that, in addition to the title, references are given to important reviews of the work named, and often a brief summary of the character of the work and of the views expressed by the reviewers, so that it is of practical utility to all students of Teutonic philology.

The section on English is under the care of Dr. John Koch, Professor in the Dorotheenstädtischen Realgymnasium in Berlin, and well known to students of English as a Chaucer scholar. This section includes about 320 works and articles in one or another department of English philology and literature, out of a total of over 1800 noticed in the volume. Those embraced under the title Monuments (*Denkmäler*) cover only the Old English (*i. e.* Anglo-Saxon) and Middle English periods, closing with the fifteenth-century, as it would increase to too great an extent the compass of the work to include with such detail the bibliography of modern English works. By way of example, it may be mentioned that under "Beowulf" fourteen titles are given, including Holder's reprint of the MS; the E. E. T. Society's Autotype Facsimile, edited by Professor Zupitza; Professor Harrison's reprint of Heyne's text; articles, programs, and essays by Professor Sievers and others; the reprint of Grein's

translation; and my own translation, with a brief account of it and references to notices in different journals. The work will be found a very useful bibliographical aid to scholars.

J. M. G.

The new edition of Hadley's Greek Grammar, by Prof. F. D. ALLEN, of Harvard, will attract general attention among school teachers. (New York, Appletons, 1884.) No one can pronounce on the merits of a school-book without actual trial. The little that can be said by one who is not in a position to make use of this practical test must relate to the theoretical foundation. Still some things are patent to the very first inspection as improvements on the old edition. Such are the marking of the quantity of the *ancipites* and the addition of the references, the latter after the revised edition of Krüger's grammar, on which Hadley was largely dependent. Of the other and more important changes, Professor Allen given a summary in his preface. The order of treatment has been changed in a few instances and the nomenclature of the suffixes of the verb simplified; the paradigms have been presented in greater accordance with Attic usage. But all is not changed that should have been changed, and those who are amused at the persistence of oversights and blunders in the best books will be amused at the persistence of some mistakes which have passed their legal majority. So, for instance, Hadley, in 289 *b*, says: '*v* is used for 21, being the 21st letter of the alphabet.' This lapse, so strange in so accomplished a scholar, has stood twenty-four years without correction, and Professor Allen's printers have been so unfortunate as to make of the *v* a *ν*. The syntax of the moods is dependent on Goodwin, and the categories of general and particular, now familiarly recognized—thanks to Bäumlein in Germany and Goodwin in this country—are unduly emphasized. Historical facts are ignored to make a rule. It is in nowise true, for instance, that *ei* with the indicative present is always particular, and the rule has to be crossed by an exception that destroys it. (See A. J. P., III, p. 435). For the treatment of the final sentence also Professor Allen does homage to Professor Goodwin. While letting down the bars so generously to the subjunctive and practically reversing the rule of sequence for so familiar an author as Homer, for Aischylos, for Sophokles, for Aristophanes (A. J. P., V, p. 438), in honor of prose freedom, it is a pity that Professor Allen should not have uttered one little word of caution as to *ὥς*, which figures side by side with *ἵνα*. In a syntax that considers so much "unimportant or self-evident," it is hardly to be expected that any distinction should be made between *ὥς* and *ὥς ἄν*, *ὅπως* and *ὅπως ἄν*, and *εἰ* with the future indicative is said not to differ essentially from *εἰάν* with subjunctive, both the examples given being oddly enough of a minatory character. But among the traditional counter-senses one finds the statement that the second person of the future "is used as a softened form of command." Supposing this to be true—and it is conspicuously false (A. J. P., IV, p. 440)—it shows a range of observation as to tone which should include some other things that have been omitted as "unimportant or self-evident." Surely after Sturm's treatise on *πρίν* (A. J. P., IV, p. 82), to say nothing of work done nearer home, a more satisfactory statement of the use of that particle might have been expected. But these and other matters must be reserved for a more elaborate article on a

number of syntactical works that demand early attention. The book is clearly printed, and the spirit of practical good sense which characterized the first edition is conspicuous in this.

Handbook of Latin Writing. By HENRY PREBLE and CHARLES P. PARKER. Boston, Ginn, Heath & Co., 1884.

The bulk of this little book consists of passages of English, chiefly narrative, and each containing some twenty or thirty lines, to be rendered into Latin. But there are no hints as to the phraseology or turns of expression it may be desirable to employ in the translation appended to the separate exercises. The editors have preferred to group together all their suggestions in an introduction, and have given a single specimen of their own handling of a similar passage. Many of these remarks are useful and show a nice appreciation of the characteristics of Latin style. But as of each it may be said with Capt. Bunsby, "the bearings of this observation lays in the application on it," some teachers may desiderate a more direct connection between the introductory hints and the separate exercises. Indeed, the maturity implied by the assumed ability of the pupil to handle the exercises without further aid seems a little inconsistent with the elementary character of some of those suggestions. However, as a collection of material, the book leaves nothing to be desired, and a teacher who will take the pains can use it with his class with profit.

C. D. MORRIS.

Deutsche Litteraturdenkmale der 18 u. 19 Jahrhunderts, herausgegeben von BERNHARD SEUFERT. No. 19. A. W. Schlegel's Vorlesungen über schöne Litteratur u. Kunst. Dritter Theil: Geschichte der romantischen Litteratur. Heilbronn, Gebrüder Henninger, 1884.

The famous Heilbronn house continues undauntedly the important enterprise of reproducing the literary monuments of Germany. This volume completes the set of A. W. Schlegel's Lectures—revolutionary in their time, still memorable, still worth reading and weighing. Slow to receive impressions from abroad, the English public felt Schlegel's views as novelties even within the memory of middle-aged men, and those whose boyhood owed much to Schlegel will be glad to revive their acquaintance with the aesthetics of the period.

A Hand-book of Latin Synonyms. Based on Meissner's *Kurzgefasste Lateinische Synonymik*. By EDGAR S. SHUMWAY. Boston, Ginn, Heath & Co., 1884.

A useful translation of a useful compendium. Still the whole thing could be put in a corner of a Latin Composition, and one dreads the multiplication of little text-books on special lines of study. The inner margin is liberal, so that students may enter such additional synonyms as they find in their reading; but students who would do this, would want something much more elaborate.

Homer's Iliad I-XII. With an introduction, a brief Homeric Grammar, and notes by D. B. MONRO. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1834.

An attractive edition for schools. The summary of the Homeric Question will be useful to beginners, though it does not give all the recent phases of the controversy; the Homeric grammar is full enough for its immediate purpose, and those who are more familiar with German work than with English—as are most American scholars—will be glad that Mr. Monro has not limited himself strictly to the limits of a school edition, but has made occasional references to special treatises in English. The notes seem to strike a happy mean.

Orbis Terrarum Antiquus in Scholarum usum depictus ab ALB. VAN KAMPEN. Gothae, Sumptibus Justi Perthes, 1884.

A serviceable school atlas—not too crowded. Upper and Lower Italy face each other—a great gain. Athens is given after Curtius and Kaupert in a large and singularly clear map, but Olympia and Troy are on too small a scale to serve any serious purpose.

Messrs. Ginn, Heath & Co., Boston, will soon publish an Introduction to the Study of Language, being a critical survey of the history and methods of comparative Philology of the Indo-European languages, by B. Delbrück, translated by E. Channing.

NECROLOGY.

LEWIS R. PACKARD,

Hillhouse Professor of the Greek Language and Literature in Yale College, died at his home, in New Haven, Sunday morning, October 26, 1884.

He was born in Philadelphia, August 22, 1836; son of Frederick A. Packard, Esq., who was prominent in all manner of good works in that city from 1829 to his death in 1867.

On his father's side, he was connected with Professors Alpheus S. Packard, of Bowdoin, A. S. Packard, of Brown, and W. A. Packard, of Princeton, and with the Quincys. Through his mother, he was connected with the Hookers, Dwights, and Whitneys. He studied at Northampton during the academic year, 1851-52. He entered Yale College in the fall of 1852, and graduated with distinction four years later. He pursued graduate studies for a year in New Haven, and during 1857-58 in Berlin. He served as tutor at Yale from 1859 to 1863, when he was appointed assistant professor of Greek. Meanwhile he was interested, also, in the study of theology; and preached occasionally as long as his health permitted. In 1866 he was made Hillhouse professor of Greek. He spent the winter of 1866-67 in Athens. He married, December 29, 1870, Miss Harriet M. Storrs, daughter of the Rev. Dr. R. S. Storrs of Brooklyn. They have one child, a daughter.

He sailed for Europe in June, 1883, to succeed Professor Goodwin as director of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens, but was taken ill on the journey, and again soon after reaching Athens; so that this year abroad was one of disappointment and suffering. He returned to this country at the close of last June; and spent the summer, first among the Catskills, then at Shelter Island, and later at Princeton, Mass. He was brought to New Haven on September 25. On the Monday before his death he enjoyed an hour's drive and slept quietly after it; but on the next day he was again worse, and failed rapidly until the end of the bravely-fought battle came. His funeral was attended in the College Chapel, on Tuesday, October 28. Addresses were made by President Porter and Professor Dwight. Prayer was offered by ex-President Woolsey. The remains were interred at Greenwood.

Professor Packard never wrote a book. Ill health prevented his perfecting and publishing works which would have honored the scholarship of the country. He published, in 1880, a polished translation of Bonitz's tract on the Homeric poems. He contributed to the *New Englander* the following papers: Lord Derby and Professor Arnold on Homer, 1866; Observations on the Modern Greeks, 1867; On the Pronunciation of Greek, 1871; Grote and Curtius, 1875; Christian Classics, 1876; Review of President Seelye's Inaugural Address on the Relations of Learning and Religion; Schliemann's Explorations, 1878. He wrote for the *New Englander* also, as well as for the

Nation, a large number of book-notices, which were always interesting and pointed. He published in the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, 1866, an article on Brücke's Physiology of Speech.

Several papers by him are printed in the Transactions of the American Philological Association: On Some Points in the Life of Thucydides, 1873; On a Passage in Homer's Odyssey (κ 81-6), 1874; On Grote's Theory of the Structure of the Iliad, 1876; Notes on Certain Passages in the *Phaedo* and *Gorgias* of Plato, 1877; The Beginning of a Written Literature in Greece, 1880. His address before the Philological Association, when he presided over it, in 1881, on the Morality and Religion of the Greeks, was admirable in its method of research and form of presentation. The first number of the AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY contained a review, by him, of Geddes's Problem of the Homeric Poems. Several years ago, he printed, for the use of his classes, notes on the first twelve books of Homer's Odyssey. He began an edition of the first six books of the Odyssey, based upon the work of Ameis-Hentze, for the College Series of Greek authors, of which he and Professor J. W. White were the editors in chief. The first book of the Odyssey for this edition is in type; but Professor Packard did not have time to complete the work. His varied learning, exquisite literary taste, good judgment, and eye quick to detect every error, would have made his influence in this series, a stimulus and a lesson to all who had to do with it.

Since the death of Professor Hadley, in 1872, Professor Packard has been occupied principally with advanced instruction, with optional classes and graduates. His standard of excellence was high for the student, as it was for himself. He was satisfied with no halfway mastery of a subject. He would accept no heedless, unreasoning pretence of scholarship; he had no mercy for the student who would pretend to know what he did not know, hiding his ignorance, rather than confessing it that he might be taught. His teaching was in the highest degree stimulating to docile minds. His mind was as classic, as beautifully clear-cut, as his face. He delighted in the most exact study of details, but strove never to allow the microscopic examination of minutiae to obscure the view of each work of literature as an entirety, a work of art. He enjoyed the study of the Greek language, but enjoyed still more the study of the Greek literature. He had announced for the next term a course in which the principal parts of the Iliad were to be read rapidly, simply as literature. He had previously conducted similar courses with eminent success.

The range of works which he had taught was very wide. He taught, again and again, all the plays of Aeschylus and Sophocles, and the odes of Pindar. Of prose authors he enjoyed especially Plato and Thucydides, although he had read with his classes extensively in the orators. He had announced, for this year, a course on the *Phaedo* of Plato for the first term, and the *Republic* for the last two terms. Of the *Republic* he was especially fond, and had made extensive preparations for an edition of it, which was to be the great work of his life. He had lectured also, on Aristotle's *Poetics*, and had prepared with care a translation of most of it. His MSS have not been examined. Some of his college lectures have been rewritten and revised so carefully that it is hoped that they are in a state to publish. His modest reserve never asserted his ready stores of learning. He had an almost Socratic irony, in assuming no

special acquaintance with a subject, until the time came for a distinct statement of facts and principles, or until chance brought out what he had done and knew. His constant companions were filled with ever-growing admiration for his attainments, as well as for his powers.

A few weeks before his marriage, in 1870, it was found that his lungs were seriously diseased. Since that time, he has struggled heroically against divers terrible diseases, continuing manfully his studies and teaching under the burden of weakness and pain. He spent two winters at the South, but in the other years he continued his college duties, except when prevented by prostrating illness. He did not suffer himself to be discouraged. He never desired an invalid's privileges or immunities. He denied himself many pleasures in order to save his strength, but insisted on regarding himself as a well man when work was concerned. He was ready for lecture, recitation, or any other college work, when most men in his condition would have made themselves as comfortable as possible at home. His indomitable will kept him not only alive but actively useful, long after physicians had thought that his work must cease. His mind was so scholarly by nature, and so well trained, that even when weak and suffering he accomplished more than most well men.

He was greatly interested from the first, in the plan for the establishment of the School of Classical Studies at Athens. His own life there had taught him the value of life in Greece to an American student, and the untold advantage to the student of such a school. His life in Greece, and acquaintance with the language, the land, and the people, his accurate and broad scholarship, his grace in meeting and attracting strangers,—all fitted him to conduct the school with success. He accepted the appointment with a diffidence which sprung largely from his uncertain health. But it was hoped that the winter in a milder climate, the relief from college duties, and the enjoyments of a sojourn in Greece would benefit his health and perhaps check the progress of the disease which was settled upon him. He reached Athens early in October, 1883, but in little more than a week was stricken down with what, at first, was thought to be a low malarial fever, but which proved to be the advance of his disease. His winter was too sad to contemplate. He was in suffering, part of the time at the point of death and expecting to die in a foreign land, far from all friends but his wife and daughter, for whom he dreaded the long, lonely journey to this country. All his hopes of study and investigation were crushed. He had prepared himself to examine critically certain vexed questions; but so far as work was concerned, he might as well have been at home. Excavations were conducted almost under his very windows, but he could not inspect them. He dwelt under the shadow of the temple of Zeus Olympius, but until near the time of his departure from Athens he could not revisit the Acropolis nor drive to the nearest points of interest. But he regained part of his strength in the spring, and was full of hope and courage as he sailed for home. He was disappointed in not gaining so rapidly as he had hoped, but laid his plans and made his preparations for this year's work. It was not until about September 1 that he definitely renounced the thought of teaching this fall. On his return to New Haven, his eye was so clear and steady,—as steady as that of Socrates,—the grasp of his hand was so firm and

warm, his interest in all college and philological matters was so great, that it was difficult to believe that his life here was so near its close. He read with eager interest Archer-Hind's *Phaedo* and Professor Allen's revision of Hadley's Grammar, and discussed with relish the last German philological publications.

His classmates in college envied his power of doing his work admirably, and then casting aside care from his mind, when he entered upon recreation. It was some such happy faculty as this, which preserved, in an unusual degree, his youthfulness and buoyancy of spirit, manner, and face. He retained to the last a most charming vein of humor, always subtle, refined, and graceful: few men could be so severe in their satire, but his wit was generally kindly. His nature was most affectionate. He loved and was loved very warmly.

We may well sorrow at our loss in the death of such a high-minded man, such a brilliant and well-equipped philologist, such a loving friend.

T. D. S.

CORRESPONDENCE.

AUSTIN, TEXAS, Nov. 17, 1884.

SIR:—As the space necessary for a reply to Prof. C. D. Morris's review of my *Observations sur Thucydide I II* (*Mélanges Graux*) would be entirely out of proportion to the importance of the subject, I must beg that those who have read his review, and take any interest in the questions in dispute, will be kind enough to read my article in the *Mélanges Graux*, and especially to observe to what extent the reviewer has misunderstood and overlooked arguments. I hope, in the course of time, to publish, in separate form, an essay on Thucydides, in which, among other things, Prof. Morris's views will be duly considered.

M. W. HUMPHREYS.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

Thanks are due to Messrs. B. Westermann & Co., New York, for material furnished.

AMERICAN.

Stormonth (Rev. J. A.) Dictionary of the English language; the pronunciation carefully revised by the Rev. P. H. Phelp. In 23 pts. 4to. *Harper* (Harper's Franklin sq. lib.) 25c.

BRITISH.

Æschylus—Agamemnon. Emendavit S. Margoliouth. 8vo, sd. *Macmillan*. 2s. 6d.

Badger (G. P.) An English-Arabic Lexicon. London, 1884. 4to. 95s.

Bible Folk Lore. A Study in Comparative Philology. By the author of "Rabbi Jeshua." London, 1884. 8vo, 356 pp. 12 m. 50 d.

Catullus. Select poems. Translated into English verse by Arthur P. Howell. Post 8vo, bds. *Thacker*. 5s.

Homer's Odyssey, Book 9. With a Commentary by John E. B. Mayor. 12mo, pp. 66. *Macmillan*. 2s. 6d.

Molière's Les Fourberies de Scapin. Edited by Gustave Masson. 12mo, sd., pp. 108. *Frowde*. 1s. 6d.

Morfill (R.) A simplified Grammar of the Polish language. London, 1884. 8vo. 4s.

Notes on Negative Postfixes in Greek and Latin. By author of "Linguistic Notes," etc. 8vo, sd. *Williams & Norgate*. 6d.

Platts (J. T.) A Dictionary of Urdu Classical Hindi, and English. London, 1884. 8vo. 75s.

Sallust's Catilinarian Conspiracy. Edited by A. M. Cook. 12mo, pp. 220. *Macmillan*. 4s. 6d.

FRENCH.

Astruc (Louis). Li Cacio. Recuei de pousesio prouvençalo, avec la traduction française en regard. In-12. *Ghio*. 3 fr. 50.

Bonnange (M.) Les homonymes français accompagnés d'applications. Livre du maître. Livre de l'élève. Bruxelles, 1884. 8vo. Preis der beiden Bde. 12 fr.

Chatelain (Émile). Paléographie des classiques latins. Première livraison (Plaute, Térence, Varron, Catulle). Avec 15 planches. In-folio. *Hachette*. 10 fr. L'ouvrage doit former environ 10 livraisons.

Cuche. Vocabulaire arabe-français à l'usage des étudiants. Paris, 1884. 12mo, 1012 pp. 15 fr.

Delinotte (L. Paul). Dictionnaire pratique des synonymes français. Avec une préface par L. Chatelain. In-12. Rotterdam, *Nilsson*. 7 fr. 50.

Du Rusquec (H.) Dictionnaire français-breton. 2e fascicule. Gr. in-8. Morlaix, *E. Lechevalier*. 6 fr.

Erkelenz (H.) L'orthographe allemande. Bruxelles, 1884. 18mo. ii, 143 pp. 2 fr.

Godefroy (F.) Dictionnaire de l'ancienne langue française. Fasc. 30. Paris, 1884. 4to. Vol. III, p. 721-796 à 3 col. 5 m. S. oben Nr. 1214.

Harlez (C. de). Manuel de la langue mandchoue. Grammaire, anthologie et lexique. Paris, 1884. 8vo, 230 pp. 10 fr.

Mistral (Fr.) Lou Tresor dóu Felibrige, ou Dictionnaire provençal français. Vol. II, fasc. 9 et 10. Maillane, 1884. 4to. p. 321-400 à 3 col. Chaque livr, 2 fr.

Pierson (P.) Métrique naturelle du langage. Paris, 1884. 8vo. xxxvii, 261 pp. 10 fr.

Regnaud (Paul). La Rhétorique sanskrite, exposée dans son développement historique et ses rapports avec la rhétorique classique, suivie de textes inédits du Bhāratīya-Nāṭya-Cāstra. 6e et 7e chapitres, et de la Rasataranginī de Bhānudatta. Gr. in-8. *Leroux*. 16 fr.

Robiou (F) et Delaunay (D.) Les institutions de l'ancienne Rome. I. Institutions militaires, politiques et religieuses. Paris, 1884. 18mo. xi, 424 pp. 3 fr. 50 c.

GERMAN.

Abel (Eug.) Scholia in Pindari Epinicia, ad librorum manuscriptorum fidem ed. E. A. Vol. II. Scholia vetera in Pindari Nemea et Isthmia continens. Fasc. 2 et 3, gr. 8. (S. 161-524.) Berlin, *Calvary & Co.* à 5.

Andronici qui fertur libelli *περί παθῶν* pars I de affectibus. Ed. Xav. Kreuttnere. Gr. 8. 50 S. Heidelberg, *C. Winter*. 1.60.

Ausgaben u. Abhandlungen aus dem Gebiete der romanischen Philologie. Veröffentlicht v. E. Stengel. XVIII-XXII, gr. 8. Marburg, *Elwert's Verl.* 9.20. Inhalt: XVIII. Die Frau im altfranzösischen Karls-Epos. Von Thdr. Krabbes. 84 S. n. 2. XIX. Ueber Metrum u. Reim der altfranzösischen Brandanlegende. Von Rich. Birkenhoff. 96 S. n. 2. XX. Die Geste des Loherains in der Prosabearbeitung der Arsenal-Handschrift. Von Alfr. Feist. 48 S. n. 1.20. XXI. Li romans de Durmart le Galois in seinem Verhältnisse zu Meraugis de Portlesguez u. den Werken Chrestiens de Troies. Von Leonh. Kirchrath. 80 S. n. 2. XXII. Die Bilder u. Vergleiche in Pulci's Morgante, nach Form u. Inhalt untersucht u. m. denen der Quellen dieses Gedichtes verglichen. Von Rob. Halfmann. 71 S. n. 2.

Bacher (Dr. Wilh.) Die hebräisch-arabische Sprachvergleichung d. Abulwalid Merwān ibn Ganāh. [Aus: "Sitzungsber. d. k. Akad. d. Wiss."] Lex.-8, 80 S. Wien, *Gerold's Sohn in Comm.* 1.20.

Beiträge zur Kunde der indogermanischen Sprachen, hrsg. v. Dr. Adb. Bezzenberger. 9 bd., 4 Hfte, gr. 8, 1 u. 2 Hft., 172 S. Göttingen, *Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht's Verl.* 10.

Beloch (Jul.) Die attische Politik seit Perikles. gr. 8, iv, 369 S. Leipzig, *Teubner*. 7.60.

Bergk (Th.) Griechische Literaturgeschichte. 3 Bd., aus dem Nachlass hrsg. v. Gust. Hinrichs. gr. 8, xi, 620 S. Berlin, *Weidmann*. 7 (1-3, 22.)

Bibliothek, altfranzösische. Hrsg. v. Prof. Dr. Wendelin Foerster. 8 Bd. 8. Heilbronn, *Henninger*. 2.40 (1-6, u. 8, 37.60). Inhalt: Orthographia gallica. Aeltester Traktat ub. französ. Aussprache u. Orthographie, nach 4 Handschriften zum ersten Mal hrsg. v. J. Stürzinger. xlv, 52 S.

Bibliotheca philologica od. geordnete Uebersicht aller auf dem Gebiete der class. Alterthumswissenschaft neu erschienenen Bücher. Hrsg. v. Dr. Gust. Kosinna. 56 Jahrg. 2 Hft., Juli-Decbr. 1883. gr. 8, S. 201-393. Ebd. 2 m. Blümner (Hugo). Technologie u. Terminologie der Gewerbe u. Künste bei Griechen u. Römern. 3 Bd. Mit 44 in den Text gedr. Holzschn. u. 1 Taf. in Lichtdr. gr. 8, viii, 343 S. Leipzig, *Teubner*. (a) 10.80.

Brambs (J. G.) De auctoritate tragoediae Christianae, quae inscribi solet *Χριστὸς πάσχω* Gregorio Nazianzeno falso attributa. 8, 72 S. Eichstätt, *Stilkrauth*. 1.60.

Brosow (Aug.) Quomodo sit Apollonius sophista ex etymologico magno explendus atque emendatus. Diss. 8, 51 S. Königsberg, *Beyer*. 1.20 m.

Bruck (Dr. Sylvius). Quae veteres de Pelasgis tradiderint. gr. 8, 60 S. Breslau, *Koebner*. 1.20.

Brugsch (Heinr.) Thesaurus inscriptionum aegyptiacarum. 4 Abth. hoch 4. Leipzig, *Hinrichs' Verl.* 58 (1-4, 214). Inhalt: Mythologische Inschriften altägypt. Denkmäler. (viii u. S. 619-850.)

Bruns (I.) Lucrez-Studien. 8vo, 80 pp. Freiburg i. Br., 1884, *Mohr*. 2 m.

Buchholz (E.) Die homerischen Realien. 3 Bd. Die religiöse u. sittl. Weltanschauung der homer. Griechen. 1 Abth. A. u. d. T.: Die homer. Götterlehre. Auf Grundlage der homer. Dichtgn. dargestellt. gr. 8, xii, 404 S. Leipzig, *Engelmann*. 6 (I-III, 1, 29).

Bystrow (A.) Regeln üb. den Accent in der russischen Sprache. 8, iv, 43 S. Mitau, *Felsko*. —60.

Catullus, Gedichte. Hrsg. u. erklärt v. Alex. Riese. gr. 8, xliii, 828 S. Leipzig, *Teubner*. 4.

Ciceronis, M. Tulli, ad M. Brutum orator. Rec. F. Heerdegen. gr. 8, xxxviii, 86 S. Leipzig, *Teubner*. 3.20 m.

Cohn (Leop.) De Heraclide Milesio grammatico scripsit, fragmenta collegit, disposuit, illustravit L. C. gr. 8, 111 S. Berlin, *Calvary & Co.* 4 m.

Commentaria in Aristotelem graeca, edita consilio et auctoritate academiae litterarum regiae borussicae. Vol. XXIII, partes III, IV, gr. 8. Berlin, *G. Reimer*. n. 9. (Vol. XXIII, cplt. 18.) Inhalt: III. Themistii quae fertur in Aristotelis Analyticorum priorum librum I paraphrasis, ed. Max Wallies. x, 164 S. VI. Anonymi in Aristotelis sophisticos elenchos paraphrasis, ed. Mich. Hayduck. vi, 84 S.

Commentationes philologiae in honorem Augusti Reifferscheidii scripserunt discipuli pientissimi. gr. 8, vii, 92 S. Breslau, *Koebner*. 2.40 m.

Cornelii Nepotis vitae. In usum scholarum rec. et verborum indicem (cum translatione anglica) addidit Mich. Gitlbauer. 8, 192 S. Freiburg i. Br. *Herder*. 1.

Delitzsch (Dr. Frdr.) Studien üb. indogermanisch-semitische Wurzelverwandtschaft. Neue Lichtdr.-Ausg. gr. 8, 119 S. Leipzig, *Henrichs' Verl.* 4.

Demosthenica, in usum scholarum collegit, H. J. Nassau Noordewier. Leidæ, 1884. 8vo, iv, 169 pp. 3 m.

Denkmäler des klassischen Alterthums zur Erläuterung des Lebens der Griechen und Römer in Religion, Kunst und Sitte. Lexikalisch bearbeitet von B. Arnold, H. Blümner, W. Deecke, etc., und dem Herausgeber A. Baumeister. Mit etwa 1400 Abbildgn., Karten und Farbendr. 2 Lfg. München, 1884. 4to, p. 49-96. *Oldenbourg*. 1 m.

Dieterici (Prof. Dr. Fr.) Die Abhandlungen der Ichwân Es-Safâ in Auswahl. Zum ersten Mal aus arab. Handschriften hrsg. 2 Hft. gr. 8, S. 173-228. Leipzig, *Hinrichs' Verl.* (à) 6.

Dionysii Thracis ars grammatica, ed. Gust. Uhlig. gr. 8, C, 224 S. Leipzig, *Teubner*. 8.

Essen (Ernst, E.) Beitrag zur Lösung der aristotelischen Frage. gr. 8, 164 S. Berlin, *Steinitz & Co.* 4.

Freund (Wilh.) Triennium philologicum. 5 Semester-Abth. 2 verb. Aufl. gr. 8, 304 S. Leipzig, *Violet*. 4.

Frölich (Frz.) Die Bedeutung d. 2 punischen Kriegen f. die Entwicklung d. römischen Heerwesens. gr. 8, 72 S. Leipzig, *Teubner*. 1.60.

Galle (P. L.) De Isocratis oratione Trapezitica. Diss. gr. 8, 38 S. Dresden, 1883. Leipzig, *Fock*. 1.

Gitlbauer (M.) Die Ueberreste griechischer Tachygraphie im Codex Vaticanus graecus 1809. 2 fasc. Mit 14 (photogr.) Taf. [Aus: "Denkschr. d. k. Akad. d. Wiss."] gr. 4, 18 S. Wien, *Gerold's Sohn in Comm.* 8. (I-II, 22.)

Giżycki (P. v.) Einleitende Bemerkungen zu einer Untersuchung über den Wert der Naturphilosophie des Epikur. 4to, 26 pp. Berlin, 1884, *Gaertner*. 1 m.

Glossae nominum, ed. Gust. Loewe. Accedunt eiusdem opuscula glossographica, collecta a Geo. Goetz. gr. 8, xviii, 264 S. Leipzig, *Teubner*. 6 m.

Grimm (Jac.) Kleinere Schriften. 7 Bd. A. u. d. T.: Recensionen u. vermischte Aufsätze. 4 Thl. gr. 8, xiii, 608 S. Berlin, *Dümmler's Verl.* 12 m.

Hahn's (K. A.) Mittelhochdeutsche Grammatik. Neu ausgearb. v. Frdr. Pfeiffer. 4 Ausg. gr. 8, xviii, 221 S. Basel, *Schwabe*. m. 3. 50.

Harth (Heinr.) Die Qualität der reinen Vokale im Neufranzösischen. Diss. 8, 51 S. Oppeln, *Franck*. 1.50 m.

Helbig (W.) Das homerische Epos, aus den Denkmälern erläutert. Archäologische Untersuchgn. Mit 2 Taf. u. 120 in den Text gedr. Abbildgn. gr. 8, viii, 353 S. Leipzig, *Teubner*. 11.20 m.

Hermann (weil. Prof. Dr. Karl Frdr.) Lehrbuch der griechischen Antiquitäten. 2 Bd. 1 Abth. A. u. d. T.: Lehrbuch der griechischen Rechtsalterthümer. 3 verm. u. verb. Aufl. Nach der 2, v. Karl Bernh. Stark besorgten Aufl. umgearb. u. hrsg. v. Gymn.-Oberlehr. Th. Thalheim. gr. 8, vii, 160 S. Freiburg i. Br., *Mohr*. 4 m.

Hoffory (Jul.) Professor Sievers u. die Principien der Sprachphysiologie. gr. 8, 48 S. Berlin, *Weidmann*. 1 m.

Homeri Iliadis carmina, seiuncta, discreta, emendata, prolegomenis et apparatu critico instructa ed. Guil. Christ. Pars II. (Finis.) gr. 8, S. 399-742. Leipzig, *Teubner*. (à) 8 m.

Jahrbuch, biographisches, f. Alterthumskunde. Begründet v. Conrad Bur-

sian, hrsg. v. Prof. Iwan Müller. 6 Jahrg. 1883. gr. 8, vi, 127 S. Berlin, *Calvary & Co.* 3 m.

Jonas (Rich.) Üb. den Gebrauch der verba frequentativa u. intensiva bei Livius. gr. 4, 24 S. Posen, *Jolowicz.* 1.20 m.

Karg (Karl). Die Sprache H. Steinböwel's. gr. 8, 62 S. Heidelberg, *G. Weiss.* 1.80 m.

Kausch (Wilh.) De Sophoclis fabularum apud Suidam reliquiis. Diss. 8, 60 S. Halis Sax. Leipzig, *Fock.* 1 m.

Kautzsch (E.) Grammatik d. Biblisch-Aramäischen. gr. 8, viii, 181 S. Leipzig, *F. C. W. Vogel.* 4 m.

Körting (Gust.) Encyklopaedie u. Methodologie der romanischen Philologie. 2 Thl. Die Encyklopaedie der romanischen Gesamt-Philologie. gr. 8, xviii, 505 S. Heilbronn, *Henninger.* 7 m. (1 u. 2, 11.)

Krebs (Frz.) Die Präpositionsadverbien in der späteren historischen Gräcität. 1 Thl. gr. 8, 61 S. München, *Lindauer.* 3 m.

Lange (R.) Altjapanische Frühlingslieder, aus der Sammlg. Kokinwakashu übers. u. erläutert. gr. 8, xxii, 112 S. Berlin, *Weidmann.* 3 m.

Laves (A.) Kritische Beiträge zu Xenophons Hellenika. gr. 4, 21 S. Berlin. Posen, *Jolowicz.* 1.20 m.

Leidenroth (F. B.) Indicis grammatici ad scholia Veneta A exceptis locis Herodiani specimen. gr. 8, 65 S. Berlin, *Calvary & Co.* 3 m.

Lepsius (R.) Die Längenmasse der Alten. gr. 8, iii, 110 S. Berlin, *Herts.* 3 m.

Leskien (Aug.) Der Ablaut der Wurzelsilben im Litauischen. [Aus: "Abhandlgn. d. k. sächs. Gesellsch. d. Wiss."] Lex.-8, 192 S. Leipzig, *Hirzel.* 7 m.

Ludwich (Arth.) Aristarchs homerische Textkritik, nach den Fragmenten d. Didymos dargestellt u. beurtheilt. Nebst Beilagen. 1 Thl. gr. 8, viii, 635 S. Leipzig, *Teubner.* 12 m.

Mahn (A.) Die epische Poesie der Provenzen. 1 Bd. Einleitung. Girart de Rossilho. 2 Lfg. 8, S. 17-64. Berlin, *Dümmler's Verl. in Comm.* (a) 1.50 m.

Martials Buch der Schauspiele. Mit Anmerkgn. v. Prof. Ludw. Friedlaender. gr. 4, 22 S. Königsberg, *Hartung.* 2 m.

Miklosich (Frz.) Die türkischen Elemente in den süd-ost- u. osteuropäischen Sprachen. 1 Hälfte. [Aus: "Denkschriften d. k. Akad. d. Wiss."] gr. 4, 102 S. Wien, *Gerold's Sohn in Comm.* 5 m.

Moritz (Prof. Dr.) Üb. das 11 Buch der Ilias. Ein Beitrag zur homer. Frage. gr. 4, 37 S. Berlin. Posen, *Jolowicz.* 1.20 m.

Müller (F.) Bemerkungen üb. das Verbum der Kolosischen Sprache. [Aus: "Sitzungsber. d. k. Akad. d. Wiss."] Lex.-8, 12 S. Wien, *Gerold's Sohn in Comm.* —40 m.

Müller (Heinr. Dietr.) Sprachgeschichtl. Studien. gr. 8, iv, 202 S. Göttingen, *Vanderhoeck & Ruprecht's Verl.* 4.40 m.

Mussafia (Adf.) Mittheilungen aus romanischen Handschriften. I. Ein altneapolitanisches Regimen sanitatis. Wien, 1884, *Gerold's Sohn.* 8vo, 122 pp. 2 m.

Obricatus (Ricardus.) De *per* praepositionis usu, qualis obtinuerit ante Ciceronis aetatem. Diss. 8, 60 S. Königsberg, *Beyer.* 1.20 m.

Opsimathes (G. H.) *Γνώμαι* sive thesaurus sententiarum et apophthegmatum ex scriptoribus graecis praecipue poetis. gr. 8, viii, 368 S. Leipzig, *T. O. Weigel*. 10 m.

Oertner. Horazens Bemerkungen üb. sich selbst in den Satiren. gr. 4, 22 S. Gross-Strehlitz, 1883, *Wilpert*. 1 m.

Osthoff (Herm.) Zur Geschichte d. Perfects im Indogermanischen m. besond. Berücksicht. auf griechisch u. lateinisch. gr. 8, ix, 653 S. Strassburg, *Trübner*. 14 m.

Otfrid's Evangelienbuch. Mit Einleitg., erklär. Anmerkgn. u. ausführl. Glossar hrsg. v. Paul Piper. 2 Thl.: Glossar. 3 u. 4 Lfg. gr. 8, S. 273-512. Freiburg i. Br., *Mohr*. à 3 m. (I-II, 4, 20.)

Paucker (C. v.) Materialien zur lateinischen Wörterbildungsgeschichte. Hrsg. v. Herm. Rönsch. VI u. VII. gr. 8. Berlin, 1883, *Calvary & Co.* à 1.20 m. (cplt. 6). Inhalt: VI. Die Adjectiva verbalia auf -ivus. 18 S. VII. Die Adverbia auf -im. 15 S.

— kleine Studien. Lexicalisches u. Syntaktisches. II-IV. gr. 8. Ebd. 1883. 5.60 m. (cplt. 6). Inhalt: II. Die Latinität d. Orosius. 41 S. n. 2.40. III. De latinitate Sulpicii Severi. 38 S. n. 2. IV. Eustathius. 15 S. n. 1.20.

— Übersicht d. der sogenannten silbernen Latinität eigenthümlichen Wortschatzes. Hrsg. v. Herm. Rönsch. gr. 8, iii, 80 S. Ebd. 3 m.

Pfizmaier (A.) Die Sprache der Aleuten u. Fuchsineln. [2 Thl.] [Aus: "Sitzungsber. d. k. Akad. d. Wiss."] Lex.-8, 82 S. Wien, *Gerold's Sohn in Comm.* à 1.20 m.

Pflugk-Harttung (Jul. v.) Perikles als Feldherr. gr. 8, ix, 143 S. Stuttgart, *Kohlhammer*. 2.60 m.

Plauti, T. Macci, comoediae, rec., instrumento critico et prolegomenis auxit Frdr. Ritschellius, sociis operae adsumtis Gust. Loewe, Geo. Goetz, Frdr. Schoell. Tomi I, fasc. 1. gr. 8. Leipzig, *Teubner*. 5.60 m. Inhalt: Trinummus. Ed. III. a Frdr. Schoell recognita. lxiv, 199 S.

Plays, pseudo-Shakespearian. Ed. by Drs. Karl Warnke and Ludw. Proescholdt. II. gr. 8. Halle, *Niemeyer*. (à) 2 m.

Plotini Enneades, praemisso Porphyrii de vita Plotini deque ordine librorum eius libello ed. Ric. Volkmann. 8, lvi, 526 S. Leipzig, *Teubner*. 5.40 m.

Plüss (Hans Thdr.) Vergil u. die epische Kunst. gr. 8, 367 S. Leipzig, *Teubner*. 8 m.

Preuss (Sieg.) Vollständiges Lexikon zu den pseudo-cäsarianischen Schriftwerken. I Tl.: bell. Gall. 8 u. bell. Alex. II Tl.: bell. Afr. u. Hisp. gr. 8, 433 S. Erlangen, *Deichert*. 8 m.

Quellen und Forschungen zur Sprach- und Culturgeschichte der germanischen Völker. Herausgegeben von Bh. ten Brink, E. Martin, W. Scherer. 53 Heft. Strassburg, 1884, *Trübner*. 8vo. 2 m. 50 d. Inhalt: Der zusammengesetzte Satz bei Berthold v. Regensburg. Ein Beitrag zur mittelhochdeutschen Syntax. Von Hb. Roetteken. xi, 124 pp.

Rammelt (Gust.) Üb. die zusammengesetzten Nomina im Hebraeischen. Diss. 8, 32 S. Halis Sax. 1883. Leipzig, *Fock*. 1 m.

Reimers (J.) Zur Entwicklung d. dorischen Tempels. gr. 8, 44 S. Berlin, *Weidmann*. 1 m.

Reinisch (Leo.) Die Chamirsprache in Abessinien. II. [Aus: "Sitzungs-

ber. d. k. Akad. d. Wiss." Lex.-8, 136 S. Wien, *Gerold's Sohn in Comm.* 2 m. (I u. II, 4.80.)

Res gestae divi Augusti. Ex monumentis Ancyrano et Apolloniensi in usum scholarum, ed. Th. Mommsen. gr. 8, 39 S. Berlin, *Weidmann.* 1.20 m.

Saadia Al-fajūmī's arabische Psalmenübersetzung, ins Deutsche übertragen v. Dr. S. H. Margulies. 1 Thl. gr. 8, iv, 51 u. 26 S. Breslau, *Preuss & Jünger.* 2.40 m.

Saalfeld (G. Alex. E. A.) Tensaurus italograecus. gr. 8, iv, 1184 Sp. Wien, *Gerold's Sohn.* 20 m.

Sammlung kurzer Grammatiken germanischer Dialecte. Hrsg. v. Wilh. Braune. II u. IV Bd. gr. 8. Halle, *Niemeyer.* 6.40 m. (I-IV, 11.60.) Inhalt: II. Mittelhochdeutsche Grammatik v. Herm. Paul. 2 Aufl., vii, 162 S. n. 2, 60. IV. Altnordische Grammatik. I. Altisländische u. altnorwegische Grammatik unter Berücksicht. d. Urnordischen v. Adf. Noreen. xii, 212 S. n. 3.80.

Sammlung germanistischer Hilfsmittel f. den praktischen Studienzweck. III. 8. Halle, *Buchh. d. Waisenhausss.* 3 m. Inhalt: Die gotische Bibel d. Vulgata, nebst der Skeireins, dem Kalender u. den Urkunden hrsg. v. Ernst Bernhardt. Textabdr. m. Angabe der handschriftl. Lesarten, nebst Glossar. vii, 334 S.

Schaeffer (Dr.) Üb. den Gebrauch d. Accusativs bei Herodot. gr. 4, 18 S. Gross-Strehlitz, *Wilpert.* 1 m.

Scheffler (Alb.) De Mercurio puero. Diss. 8, 53 S. Königsberg, (*Beyer.*) 1.20 m.

Schirlitz (C.) De Platonis Parmenide. gr. 4, 25 S. Neustettin. Berlin, *Calvary & Co.* 1.60 m.

Schneider (Gus.) Die platonische Metaphysik, auf Grund der in Philebus gegebenen Principien in ihren wesentlichsten Zügen dargestellt. gr. 8, xi, 172 S. Leipzig, *Teubner.* 4 m.

Schneidewin (Max.) Die homerische Naivetät. 2 Aufl. 8, vii, 156 S. Hameln, *Brecht.* 2.75 m.

— deutsch u. lateinisch gefasste disponierende Übersicht der Ciceronianischen Miloniana u. Sestiana. 8, 47 S. Ebd. —90 m.

Schönberg (J.) Kshemendra's Kavikanthābharaṇa. [Aus: "Sitzungsber. d. k. Akad. d. Wiss." Lex.-8, 29 S. Wien, *Gerold's Sohn in Comm.* 50 m.]

Schweder (E.) Beiträge zur Kritik der Chorographie d. Augustus. 3 Thl. gr. 8, 59 S. Kiel, 1883, *Universitäts-Buchh.* 2 m. (1-3, 6.)

Schweizerisches Idiotikon. 6 Heft. Bearbeitet von F. Staub und L. Tobler. Frauenfeld, 1884, *Huber.* 4to. Sp. 769-928. 2 m.

Soltau (Wilh.) Die Gültigkeit der Plebiscite. gr. 8, xii, 175 S. Berlin, *Calvary & Co.* 7 m.

Statius, P. Papinius. Vol. II. Achilleis et Thebais. Rec. Phpp. Kollmann. Fasc. II. Thebais. 8, xviii, 475 S. Leipzig, *Teubner.* 4.80 m. (cplt. 7, 35.)

Studien, Berliner, f. classische Philologie u. Archaeologie. Hrsg. v. Ferd. Ascherson. 2 Halbbd. gr. 8, S. 357-783. Berlin, *Calvary & Co.* 11.50 m. (1 Bd. cplt. 19.25.)

Studien, neuphilologische. Hrsg. v. Prof. Dr. Gust. Körting. 4 Hft. gr. 8. Paderborn, *F. Schöningh.* 1.35 m. (cplt. 5.) Inhalt: Darstellung der Syntax in Cynewulf's Elene. Von Realgymn.-Lehr. Dr. Jos. Schürmann. S. 287-398.

Teichert (Paul). De fontibus Quintiliani rhetoricis. Diss. 8, 58 S. Königsberg, *Beyer*. 1.20 m.

Textbibliothek, altdeutsche, hrsg. v. H. Paul. Nr. 6. 8. Halle, *Niemeyer*. 1.50 m. Inhalt: König Rother. Hrsg. von K. v. Bahder. 162 S.

Thurneysen (Rud.) Keltoromanisches. gr. 8, v. 128 S. Halle, *Niemeyer*. 3.60 m.
Tichelmann (Ludov.) De versibus Ionicis a minore apud poetas graecos obviis. Diss. 8, 64 S. Königsberg, *Beyer*. 1.20 m.

Tiktin (H.) Studien zur romanischen Philologie. 1 Thl. gr. 8, v. 119 S. Leipzig, *Breitkopf & Härtel*. 3 m.

Tobler (Adf.) Das Buch d. Uguçon da Laodho. [Aus: "Abhandlgn. d. k. preuss. Akad. d. Wiss. zu Berlin."] gr. 4, 96 S. Berlin, *Dümmler's Verl.* 5 m.

Toepke (Gust.) Die Matrikel der Universität Heidelberg von 1386 bis 1662. gr. 8, lxxvi, 697 S. Heidelberg, *C. Winter in Comm.* 25 m.

Trautmann (M.) Die Sprachlaute im Allgemeinen und die Laute des Englischen, Französischen und Deutschen im Besondern. 1 Hälfte. Leipzig, 1884, *Fock*. 8vo, iv, 160 pp. Mit 10 Holzschn. 6 m.

Tschudi (J. J.) Organismus der Khetšua-Sprache. gr. 8, xvi, 534 S. Leipzig, *Brockhaus*. 25.

Uhle (Paul). Quaestiones de orationum Demostheni falso addictarum scriptoribus. Particula I. De orationum XXXV, XXXXIII, XXXXVI—L, LII, LIII, LIX scriptoribus. Diss. gr. 8, 120 S. Hagen, *Risel & Co.* 2.40 m.

Wernicke (Conr.) De Pausaniae periegetae studiis Herodoteis. gr. 8, 116 S. Berlin, *Weidmann*. 2 m.

Ysengrimus. Hrsg. u. erklärt v. Ernst Voigt. gr. 8, iv, cxlvi, 470 S. m. 1 Taf. Halle, *Buchh. d. Waisenhauses*. 8 m.

Zehetmayer (Sebast.) Die analog vergleichende Etymologie, in Beispielen erläutert. gr. 8, 37 S. Freising, *Datterer*. 1 m.

Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft. Hrsg. v. Müller, Schlottmann, Krehl, Windisch, unter der verantwortl. Red. v. Prof. Dr. E. Windisch. Suppl. zum 33 Bde. gr. 8. Leipzig, 1883, *Brockhaus' Sort.* 6 m. Inhalt: Wissenschaftlicher Jahresbericht üb. die morgenländischen Studien im J. 1878. Unter Mitwirkg. mehrerer Fachgelehrten hrsg. v. Ernst Kuhn. iii, 178 S.

Zeitschrift f. romanische Philologie, hrsg. v. Prof. Dr. Gust. Gröber. 1884. 8 Bd. gr. 8, 1 Hft. 160 S. Halle, *Niemeyer*. 20 m.

Zelechowski (Eug.) Ruthenisch-deutsches Wörterbuch. 7-10 Hft. gr. 8, S. 321-480. Lemberg. Leipzig, *Harrassowitz*. 4 m. (1-10, 12.)

ITALIAN.

Forcellini (Aegid.) Totius latinitatis lexicon, opera et studio Dr. Vinc. De-Vit. Distr. 25. gr. 4, 3 Bd. S. 313-392. Prati. Leipzig, *Brockhaus' Sort.* (a) 2.50 m.

Foulquez (E. W.) Grammatica indostana ad uso degli Italiani. Napoli, 1884. 8vo. 3 m. 60 d.

SWEDISH.

Centerwall (J.) Julianus affällingen. En bild från den döende antiken. Stockholm, 1884. 8vo, 236 pp. 5 m. 25 m.

Schwerin (H. H. v.) Herodots framställning af Europas geografi. Lund, 1884. 8vo, 207 pp. Mit 1 Karte. 3 m. 75 d.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

Brandt (H. C. G.) A Grammar of the German Language for High Schools and Colleges. New York and London, *G. P. Putnam's Sons*, 1884. \$1.50.

Brinton's Library of aboriginal American Literature. No. IV. A migration legend of the Creek Indians, with a linguistic, historic and ethnographic introduction by Albert S. Gatschet. Vol. 1. Philadelphia, *D. G. Brinton*, 1884.

Casartelli (L. C.) La Philosophie religieuse du Mazdéisme sous les Sassanides. Paris, *Maisonneuve*, 1884.

Cornelii Nepotis Vitae. Ed. Georgius Andresen. (Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum edita curante Carolo Schenkl.) Lipsiae, *G. Freytag*, 1884. 60 pf.

Cornelii Nepotis Vitae. Rev. et em. Andreas Weidner, Lipsiae, *G. Freytag*, 1884. 60 pf.

Delbrück (B.) Einleitung in das Sprachstudium. 2te Auflage. Leipzig, *Breitkopf u. Härtel*, 1884.

Deutsch (William). Colloquial Exercises and select German Reader. Boston, *Ginn, Heath & Co.*, 1884.

Deutsche Litteraturdenkmale des 18 u. 19 Jahrhunderts in Neudrucken herausg. v. Bernhard Seuffert. A. W. Schlegel's Vorlesungen über schöne Litteratur u. Kunst. Dritter Theil: Geschichte der Romantischen Litteratur. Heilbronn, *Gebr. Henninger*, 1884. 2m. 50.

Eutropi Breviarium ab urbe condita ed. Carolus Wagener. 1m. 20.

Französische Studien herausg. v. Körting u. Koschwitz. IV Band. 5 (Schluss-) Heft. Mushacke (W.) Geschichte der Entwicklung der Mundart von Montpellier. Heilbronn, *Gebr. Henninger*, 1884.

Fulton and Trueblood. Choice Readings. Boston, *Ginn, Heath & Co.*, 1884. \$1.65.

Gerth (B.) Kurzgefasste Griechische Grammatik. Im Anschluss an die Curtius'sche gr. Schulgrammatik. Leipzig, *G. Freytag*, 1884. 1m. 80.

Goebel (Dr. Julius). Ueber tragische Schuld u. Sühne. Berlin, *Carl Duncker's Verlag*, 1884.

Hitchcock (Dr. E.) A manual of gymnastic exercises. Boston, *Ginn, Heath & Co.*, 1884. 50c.

Ginn (F. B.) Addition manual. Boston, *Ginn, Heath & Co.*, 1884. 20c.

Holden (H. C.) ΞΕΝΟΦΩΝΤΟΣ ΟΙΚΟΝΟΜΙΚΟΣ. The Oeconomicus of Xenophon, with introduction, explanatory notes, critical appendix and lexicon. London and New York, *Macmillan*, 1884 (through Cushings & Bailey, Baltimore). 1.60.

Holtzmann (Adolf). Grammatisches aus dem Mahabharata. Ein Anhang zu W. D. Whitney's Indischen Grammatik. Leipzig, *Breitkopf u. Härtel*, 1884.

Kampen (Albert van). Orbis Terrarum Antiquus in scholarum usum descripta. Gotha, *Justus Perthes*, 1884.

Körting (G.) *Encyclopaedie u. Methodologie der Romanischen Philologie. Zweiter Theil. Die Encyclopaedie der Romanischen Gesamt-Philologie.* Heilbronn, *Gebr. Henninger*, 1884. 7m.

Krumbacher (Karl). *Beiträge zu einer Geschichte der griechischen Sprache* (Münchener Habilitationsschrift). Weimar, 1884.

Lee (J. H. Warburton). *T. Lucreti Cari de Rerum Natura. I-III.* London and New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1884. \$1.10.

Monro (D. B.) *Homer—Iliad. Books I-XII.* Oxford, *Clarendon Press*, 1884.

Ovidi (P.) *Nasonis Carmina in exilio composita.* Rec. O. Güthling. Lipsiae, *G. Freytag*, 1884. 1m. 40.

Prammer (Ignaz). *Schulwörterbuch zu Cäsar's Commentarii de bello Gallico.* Prag, *Tempisky*. Leipzig, *G. Freytag*, 1884.

Preble (Henry) and Parker (Charles P.) *Hand-book of Latin Writing.* Boston, *Ginn, Heath & Co.*, 1884.

Shorey (Paul). *De Platonis idearum doctrina atque mentis humanae notionibus commentatio.* (Diss.) Munich, *Theodor Ackermann*, 1884.

Shumway (Edgar S.) *A hand-book of Latin Synonyms based on Meissner's Kurzgefasste Lateinische Synonymik.* Boston, *Ginn, Heath & Co.*, 1884. 30c.

Sophocles' *Antigone.* Edited on the basis of Wolff's edition by M. L. D'Ooge. Boston, *Ginn, Heath & Co.*, 1884.

Sophoclis *Philoctetes.* Ed. F. Schubart. Lipsiae, *G. Freytag*. 40 pf.

Vietor (W.) *Elemente der Phonetik u. Orthoepie des Deutschen, Englischen u. Französischen mit Rücksicht auf die Bedürfnisse des Lehrfaches.* Heilbronn, *Gebr. Henninger*, 1884. 4m. 80.

Wentworth and Hill's *Exercise-Manual. No. 11. Geometry.* Boston, *Ginn, Heath & Co.*, 1884. 80c.

Wölfflin (E.) *Archiv für Lateinische Lexikographie u. Grammatik. 1ster Jahrg. Heft 3.* Leipzig, 1884.

Ybarra (Alejandro). *Practical method for learning Spanish.* *Ginn, Heath & Co.*, 1884.

CORRECTIONS.

In the last number of the Journal, p. 239, it was stated that Van Herwerden had not adopted the conjecture of Thiersch in Thuc. I 11, though recommended by Cobet. I now see, in the 'Addenda et corrigenda,' at the close of his edition of the eighth book, which I had not at that time received, the entry: "11, 1, ἐκπαθησαν cit. Thiersch, probante Cobeto."—C. D. MORRIS.

Page 355, Note 4, for in . . . , read in Roscher's *Lexikon der Gr. u. Röm. Mythologie*.

Page 395, l. 3, the gap which the reader will notice at this point, due to the misplacing of Professor Toy's MS, will be filled in the next number.